

Religious Education

The Journal of The Religious Education Association

(Copyright, 1917, by The Religious Education Association)

VOL. XII

APRIL, 1917

No. 2

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES | 82 |
| INSTRUMENTS AND ENDS IN SPIRITUAL WORLD CONQUEST | 83 |
| <i>Francis J. McConnell</i> | |
| THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN | 94 |
| <i>Francis G. Peabody</i> | |
| PEACE AND WORLD ORDER | 103 |
| <i>James H. Kirkland</i> | |
| RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MIND | 108 |
| <i>John Howard Melish</i> | |
| RELIGIOUS TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL STUDIES | 114 |
| <i>Ernest Carroll Moore</i> | |
| RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION | 123 |
| <i>George Albert Coe</i> | |
| WHAT TRAINING IN EDUCATION SHOULD BE REQUIRED OF ALL SEMINARY GRADUATES? | 128 |
| <i>William J. Davidson</i> | |
| BIBLE STUDY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS | 136 |
| <i>A Committee Report</i> | |
| STANDARDIZATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS IN COLLEGES | 139 |
| <i>A Committee Report</i> | |
| WORLD-WIDE WORK IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION | 146 |
| <i>Henry F. Cope</i> | |
| A CITY BIBLICAL INSTITUTE | 155 |
| <i>Henry T. Fowler</i> | |
| SUNDAY SCHOOL IDEALS | 158 |
| MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING | 160 |
| REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE | 161 |
| NEWS AND NOTES — BOOK REVIEWS | 167 |

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES*

The moral inadequacy of a social order that could issue in a world war, compels a rigorous scrutiny of the underlying premises of our civilization.

We must believe that there can be a new and better social order based not on mutual distrust and selfish competition but upon confidence and goodwill, upon the spirit of service and co-operation.

Such a social order will exist in institutions, churches, industries, brotherhoods, nations, organized pre-eminently for human welfare, and ever willing to surrender anything that creates injustice and impedes progress.

Such a social order will provide for the fullest self development of every individual, the right to grow, the right to serve for the joy of service.

Such a social order will recognize the will of God in the life and destiny of man, and will train its citizens to become members of an enduring friendship.

The new social order must be brought to pass by a new education. The whole education of children and youth in home and church and school and community must be controlled by the highest social ideals, and must be so organized as to promote sympathy and insight through significant social experience.

The building of the new social order calls for the earnest co-operation and effective organization of all social and educational agencies, in the community, in the nation and in the world. It calls for a consecrated leadership responsive to the new vision.

*Adopted at the Fourteenth Annual Convention of The Religious Education Association, Boston, March 1, 1917.

INSTRUMENTS AND ENDS IN SPIRITUAL WORLD CONQUEST*

FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Denver, Colo.

A distinguished advocate of military preparedness was some time ago urging his favorite theme before a large audience. In response to requests by the speaker for questions, a hearer arose and asked just what nation the United States should prepare to fight in accordance with sound world policy. The militarist is reported to have replied, "I will answer that question if you will tell me just what hurricane a steamship captain prepares to meet as he puts out from port."

This reply has been pronounced by militarist commentators to be absolutely crushing, and yet there is good reason for suspecting that the question of the auditor was worthy of less summary treatment than it received. As a matter of fact the steamship captain does not prepare for hurricanes in hit-or-miss fashion. He prepares for the kind of hurricane he is likely to meet in a particular quarter of the globe. North Atlantic cyclones are different from South Atlantic storms, and both are different from the hurricanes of the Chinese and Indian seas. A good captain knows something of world geography. If a nation is to arm itself for war the first step is to frame some sort of world policy toward which it is to work. Preparedness for war against England would mean one course; against Germany another; against Latin American nations still another course; and against oriental nations still another. Before any preparedness movement is taken seriously, first study should be given to the world policy of which the movement is a part.

The Religious Education Association has set for itself as a theme this year the task before religious education in helping shape a new world order. That the world cannot emerge from its present stress unchanged is obvious enough to the most rudimentary intelligence. Religion was caught unawares by the outbreak of the terrific world tempest; but there is no reason why it should be surprised by the problems which are to follow the war. Already these are beginning to take form. It is clear that the present conflict came out of certain inadequacies of the view of the world and of values. Religious education can at least attempt something to provide against such inadequacies in the future.

*The President's annual address, delivered at the Fourteenth General Convention of the Religious Education Association; Boston, Feb. 27-March 1, 1917.

As we approach the new world order we must insist upon the need of some sort of back-lying world-view as a part of the training of the youth of our day; some survey of spiritual world-geography before the youth puts to sea. The education of the past thirty years has of course run largely to the scientific method. There has been recently no direct academic attack on world-philosophies as such, but there has been all along the assumption that a student trained in scientific method could form a world-philosophy for himself. This has overlooked the fact that there is really no such thing as scientific method. There are rather scientific methods. Every particular realm of scientific research is governed by its own principles. Only in most general terms can we trace the operation of any one law in the various fields. Scientific method in astronomy is different from scientific method in biology. A poor mathematician would not be likely to succeed in astronomy: he might possess qualities which would make him marvelously effective in biology. So that scientific method is apt to run to specialism: and specialism makes against the comprehensiveness of these world-views of whose importance we are now speaking. Let the scientifically trained specialist be cross-examined for his views of philosophy; it will very likely be found that he has carried into his philosophy the naive fancies which date from pre-reflective days, or he seeks to apply the formulas governing matter and force in realms where they are manifestly not applicable. The result in any case is confusion. A worthy philosophic world-view can come only from those who are trained to critical study of such views.

What difference, however, does it make whether one has a philosophy or not? Of what use are world-views? We have to live from day to day and from one deed to the next. Is it not enough to have a practical system which will hold through what Mill called, "a reasonable degree of extension to adjacent cases?" For the work-a-day purposes of ordinary existence a few philosophical insights and a handful of common-sense maxims may indeed suffice; but when we look out over masses of men we see that their relations to one another are very apt to be influenced not indeed by formal and abstract reasonings, but nevertheless by differing attitudes toward the problem of life as a whole. Oriental peoples, for example, are at least in part the outcome of oriental ways of looking at the universe. Of course it is open to anyone to object that the views themselves are outcomes of circumstances over which the peoples have no control. The peoples of India, for example, seem helpless in the presence of vast facts of physical nature. But even

if we concede that world-views are thus the outcomes of vast forces working upon helpless minds, still we must insist that the view when once formed enters into the life of the people and adds to the hopelessness.

There are certainly differences in the world-views held by the contending nations in the present European conflict. While both sets of contestants may read the same Bible and pray to the same God, there is nevertheless a great gulf fixed between the interpretation of the Bible and God on one side and that on the other. The struggle here may be at bottom economic, but above the warring economic forces there arise sooner or later differing world-conceptions which add to the deadliness of the struggle. Or to seek illustration in quieter spheres: a materialist, a pantheist, and a theist may get on very well together as business partners or as members of the same club; this for the reason that the world-views may not come up for discussion, or if they do, they arise merely as themes for pleasant interchange of opinion. Let these different systems however, be taken seriously by masses of the people, and the outcome in life reveals the deep difference in the backlying conceptions.

Just as in warfare or in industry or in constructive statesmanship the fundamental question is as to the soundness of the view of the whole field, so it is in the relation of religion to the problems of the world. It is not always enough merely to perform good deeds; it is not enough to rest contented in fragmentary, piece-meal notions. There must be some deliberate attempt to come to terms with the question as to what powers are ruling this universe, and what those powers are working toward. We may admit with all candor that we cannot tell why particular events occur as they do; we may disavow all intention to seek for detailed meanings in the goings-on of the world. But this admission is entirely compatible with the hopefulness growing out of a world-view which looks toward a right outcome in the end. We may admit also that philosophy can never go far, but we can determine how far it can go and how far faith must come in to supplement our more formal reasoning. It may be that everything rests finally down upon the will to believe, but reflection ought to play its part in selection of objects worthy of belief. In a word, it is one duty of religion in gazing toward that new world which is to come, to seek to frame a world-conception which shall give spiritual values some opportunity for recognition.

This is not a plea for the compulsory in higher institutions of learning. It is, however, an earnest insistence upon the right of

college and university students to have a chance to see what are the competing world-views. An indication of what can be done is to be found in the response of some of the more important state universities to enlightened public demand for courses in philosophy which enable the student to see at least what the more important world-conceptions are, and the points of difference between them. The authorities of one great state university have taken the ground that the university should respond with instruction in any line for which there is reasonable demand. At first the authorities heeded the voices which called for better farming methods, better ways of building roads, better engineering instruction. Later, the demand of religious opinion for worthy instruction in fundamental views of the universe has met with like response at this university, with the result that whereas ten years ago the only important course in philosophy was a semester's instruction in Haeckel's "Riddles of the Universe," now the student who so desires can at least be introduced to all the greater philosophies.

Educators have come to see that practically everybody has some sort of philosophy. If we must be philosophers, if we are to think at all, it is worth while for us to try to learn something about good philosophy. We must all admit that any good philosophy makes adequate place for the play of spiritual forces in the world. As religious educators we bring these forces out into fuller recognition; though without pleading for any particular orthodoxy. We would seek to make man know the assumptions on which he proceeds in dealing with the universe. Assumption plays its part in all thinking. Its influence is inevitable. Since this is true, the need of the right kind of assumptions becomes imperative. At least the need of recognizing that assumptions are at work becomes a first intellectual duty.

A second obligation upon those charged with making religious education count in shaping the new world-order is that of increased emphasis on the human values. It is to be expected that at the close of the present war the public opinion of virtually the entire civilized world will turn with renewed scrutiny toward all social institutions. We can be reasonably certain also that the test by which social institutions will be judged will be as never before the human test. It is a commonplace, of course, that all manner of religious organizations must be judged by their efficiency in ministering to human needs. There is no rightful place in this world for a religious organization merely as such. Church constitutions and even church creeds and ceremonials are just so many channels for

benefits to men. The men, women, and children of this present world are the objects for which organized religion exists. The challenge which we must put to every form of religious institution is: What kind of men does it produce?

We repeat that so far as church organizations go we are fast learning this lesson, even though many of us are still in the primary classes. We must master the same lesson concerning educational systems. It is of course generally agreed upon that the rankest of educational heresies is to attempt to fit growing minds to the curriculum rather than the curriculum to the needs of growing minds. But when we descend from theory to practice we find that in many branches of study the distinctively human viewpoint is apt to be obscured.

For example, suppose we return for the moment to the scientific method. We very often hear it said that the scientific method strictly applied has nothing to do with the practical consequences involved in its own discoveries. The student learns for the sake of science itself. He is not even to raise the question as to the utility of what he discovers. He merely asks what is the truth without regard to the effects of the truth on human life. Now we know well enough what the scientist has in mind by utterances like this. He is protesting against the use of scientific methods merely for purposes of so-called practical usefulness. He does not care to see the realm of pure science invaded by too many inventors. He has the same repulsion against using his strictly scientific talent for devising an invention for the patent office that the artist feels toward lowering a high artistic ideal by employing artistic skill to paint signs and advertisements. We may say in passing that even here the scientist may become too much of a purist. It is not so degrading as is sometimes implied for a scientist to utilize bacteriological knowledge, for example, to fight typhoid or yellow fever. But admitting the validity of the scientific purist's scruples, we must avow our conviction that this doctrine of science for science's own sake sometimes overlooks the fact that even in devotion to pure science there is a human reference.

Not all scientific discoveries are on the same plane. There must be some sense of perspective in estimating the worth of scientific achievement. A scientist might give himself to elaborate statistical computations of the number of bricks in all the sidewalks of a city. He might conceivably encounter some problems that would involve resort to complicated mathematical apparatus, but we could get no large hearing for his results. We do reject some sci-

tific findings as not worth while. The results must fit into an intellectual system, or must gratify our craving for symmetry and unity, or must be inherently interesting. In short the standard here is a human standard. We value the most abstruse calculations in astronomy for the effect they have on human minds as those minds give themselves to profound contemplation. Conceding that the scientific method must not be used solely for a bread and butter purpose, we must insist that its value lies nevertheless in the degree to which it ministers to human needs, the needs being so construed as to include the demands of the higher rational and aesthetic faculties.

This may seem like rather a fine point, but clear recognition of our contention will have its value. Man does not indeed live by bread alone: but he does not live at all on things that have no sort of relation to a really human interest. If we can force this human reference out into large recognition in all our educational work, we shall do something to make the educational systems of our time more worth-while among the forces of the world.

What I have thus far said has to do more especially with such general educational training as we look for in a soundly conceived college course. When we come to the university branches in which the more practical problems of men and things are studied, we need further emphasis on the human values. Glance at the political and social sciences. If it is true that Germany of the present day has over-emphasized the ideal of the state as superior to concrete human life as such, it must be recognized that the German educational system must take its share of the blame. The doctrine of the dominance of the state as over and above inherent human values as such has been a favorite theme in the departments of political science in Germany for forty years. Or take any social arrangement which makes possible the division of men into classes and groups. One danger before educational institutions is that they are apt to justify an established order, especially in the realm of economics where all sorts of unreal abstractions have held sway. The whole system of political economy needs re-writing from the point of view of the human values affected by commerce and industry. The "economic man" has about disappeared, to be sure, but we still have various "iron laws" of wages, of supply and demand, of enlightened self-interest as the determining factor in industrial processes. One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the breaking up of various economic orthodoxies.

The colleges and universities of the land are not to be used as

agents of propaganda; but on the other hand, they are not to be turned away from vast human movements because these movements lend themselves easily to the propagandists. The present speaker is not himself a socialist, but he believes there can hardly be any more harmful educational policy than to allow a youth to pass through a higher educational institution without at least the opportunity for introduction to sympathetic understanding of socialism. In spite of theories of economic determinism and of surplus value and of class conflict, there is more recognition of the forces that touch ordinary human existence in well-informed discussions of socialism than in the discussions of almost any other social theme. The institution which allows this immense human movement to sweep past its doors unobserved simply knows not the day of its visitation. So also with trade-unionism. We profess—all of us—to believe in the advance of democracy. In spite of the tyranny of labor leaders here and there, in spite of ill-considered resorts to violence or threat, there is more real democracy in actual labor-union procedure than in the procedure of any legislative assembly in the United States. That is to say, the thought and desire of the main mass come nearer getting into expression in the debates and decisions of labor-unions than in the legislatures. The real reasons for which things are done, unworthy as they sometimes seem, come out into fuller and more honest statement. Now does it not sometimes occur that the university graduate who professes greatest interest in democratic movements knows nothing about the movements which are most significant for democracy?

If colleges and universities are to stand for the human values they must set their own houses in order. An educational system must be on its guard against shibboleths like the "traditions of the school," "the school spirit," "the school point of view." Any organization is in danger when it runs too smoothly. When political and ecclesiastical organizations become conspicuously effective there is usually ground for suspicion that their effectiveness is merely organizational. Even the slogan "Efficiency," which has done so much for the economical utilization of energy in our time, needs to be subjected to the severest cross-examination. It may be recalled that a noted efficiency expert some years ago made the discovery that many day-laborers waste energy in "extra" movements in performing their tasks. This expert claimed that if these movements could be utilized properly they would mean the laying of so many more bricks or the driving of so many more nails. As a matter of fact, most of these extra movements, though they

looked like flourishes, are really balancing motions, or "easing-off" motions, which help the physical organism at its work. The difference is between the technical and the human point of view. A celebrated preparatory school in the United States once boasted of the number of students it had dismissed as failures. The boasting was presumably over the large efficiency of the school. Another school picked up many of these same failures, fitted them for colleges in which they took even better rank than the students from the school which had dismissed them to maintain its own efficiency. Here was an instance of devotion to a system which made for inefficiency when viewed from the human angle. If a youth fails in school, of course the reason may be the stupidity of the youth. There is just a bare chance on the other hand, that the reason may be the stupidity of the school. Especially is this true when the school becomes so institutionalized as to forget the human values.

This over-sight of the human is the one pestilent heresy against which any Christian who understands himself must forever protest. It is not our function to discuss doctrinal themes; but the most radical critic of organized Christianity will admit that Christianity has for its power the doctrine of the incarnation of the Divine in the human. Anything, therefore, which minimizes the value of the human will, in the end blocks a channel against a revelation of the Divine. The Founder of Christianity did not come that men might have institutions and might have them more abundantly; He came rather that they might have life, and have it more abundantly. In every sphere of the new world-order must be preached the gospel that the human has right-of-way over everything else whatsoever. The acceptance of this gospel for churches and for schools gives us the right to call for this acceptance in industry and in national policies and in international relationships.

A third duty of religious educators as they look toward forming the new world-order is that of laying stress upon righteousness in method in all activities for the betterment of the world. We in America, confronted by swarms of new problems, have come to somewhat careless acceptance of the doctrine that only results count. No matter about the method, is the dictum of the practical man; produce the results. This practical man's point of view has come to large sway in all spheres of effort. Even in philosophy a most popular doctrine is that truth is to be tested by the way it works.

The fundamental aims in most of our American efforts for advancement have been sound. In the days just ahead of us, how-

ever, we may expect to see increasing attention to the imperativeness of right method in reaching the right outcome. This means that we shall scrutinize very closely and radically change some of the means for social advance which have hitherto seemed to many of us to be altogether valid.

Just at present the country is stirred by a so-called preparedness movement. A study of this movement will reveal not only signs of healthy awakening of the public mind, but also tendencies to evil if the awakening of that mind does not quicken good sense and self-control at the same time that it arouses the more eager patriotism. For the whole preparedness propaganda has to do with the proper place of physical force in social advance. We can all agree, of course, that the control of physical force is one of the chief duties of man in his relation to the world in which he lives. In the conquest of nature men have gone far enough to show that final victory is possible, that is to say, that the race is in sight of effective enough mastery of physical forces to insure against starvation and the more deadly contagious diseases. But while this victory seems assured, the triumph over society itself has not yet been won. There has not yet been devised any scheme of social constitution manifestly adequate to the strains upon it; so that clamor arises for the use of force for social and national progress. Put the plan through by sheer might, is often the popular cry. The most that can be said of force thus used is that it is safe only as it is called in for what might be characterized as police purposes. The abnormal and the wicked will must be kept in subjection to the interests of the larger liberty of the vast majority of men.

In addition also, we all concede the inevitability of dependence upon force in self-defense. But iteration and re-iteration of the doctrine that the best defense is aggressive and that the defender is wisest if he attacks first, opens the door to a horde of frightful abuses. The havoc wrought by this aggressiveness is not so much in its physical devastation as in its sins against the ideals of humanity. Moreover there is grave question as to whether conquest by force is ever in the long run effective. Men are not convinced of the justice of the conqueror's cause because the conqueror is a conqueror. All talk about the good that has come out of war must be balanced by the sober reflection as to whether the same or even greater good might not have been achieved by other than warlike instruments. Moreover it is the function of the religious leader to-day to protest against glorification of war itself by glorifying its motive. War itself is the devil's own business.

The men who actually do the fighting feel thus about the war. Only avowed militarists and preachers and college professors are able to behold the splendor of war. One of the subtlest dangers of the academic mind lies in its power to find a plausible justification for something inherently evil; or to shift the perspective so as to give a false focus. "As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free," is better poetry than "As He died to make men holy, let us kill to make men free," but this latter statement is closer to the truth. If we must fight let us fight, but let us keep our minds open to the awfulness of what we are doing.

Again there must be most exacting scrutiny of the use of money for advance of social ideals. We have come to feel that in the relations between nations, especially in the contacts between the so-called "more-favored" and the so-called "less-favored" nations, commercial and industrial methods must be held strictly under moral control. If the commercial interests of this country had their way, the very life would be quickly choked out of Mexico as an independent nation: and this with the avowed intention of doing good to the people of Mexico themselves. As public opinion comes more and more to rule financial and industrial activities here at home, the more these same activities resent suggestions of control in foreign lands, or they insist upon government by dictatorship in those lands for the good of the people themselves. Too often well-meaning but unenlightened missionaries fall in with this call. When a missionary pleads for strong mastery of non-Christian people by an outside government that he may have a chance to preach his gospel, he knows not what spirit he is of.

But we do not have in mind only international relationships. We may think of matters nearer home. The increase of huge endowments for colleges and universities and other social agencies must go on; but such accumulations are permissible only on condition that presidents and trustees act under the heaviest bonds of social responsibility. The financial interests of an institution itself must never be allowed to weigh in the slightest in the discussions of social problems. We may well rejoice over the increasing sensitiveness on the part of society to the social effects of vested funds. Professor Scudder of Wellesley has suggested a "white list" of investments for those devoted to the welfare of society. Her scheme may not seem wholly practicable, but every educational institution's investments should be white.

The question, however, goes deeper than all this. Take the socialistic argument against payment of interest. Personally I am

not able to see that the socialist has made his whole case against interest. But suppose an institution should seek to stop such debate because its own income might be imperiled! Fundamentally any attempt to control social policies on financial considerations is but one step removed from controlling them by force. The possession of a huge fund to be used for social purposes is not after all so very much different from the possession of vast reservoirs of physical force. We may well rejoice at the growth of those huge endowments in this country which are devoted to social betterment. These endowment funds have for the most part been wisely used, but let us not blind our eyes to the fact that they are after all a form of force. Institutions changing their policies to get aid from these funds do not always make the change because they are convinced of the unwisdom of these policies, but because they are compelled to change if they are to be helped. When the force of such a fund is employed to bring an institution to better administrative methods only good can result. When the force is used, however, to shape social and educational ideals as such, peril is imminent; for the whole problem is soon lifted away from the realm of discussion and brought under the sway of practically physical forces. Starvation is really one of the most effective methods of physical warfare.

A method of social betterment which has seemed entirely permissible is the control of public opinion. It is our business, we say, to make social atmosphere in which some ideas can live and some others must die. Here again the method may be used in entirely legitimate fashion. There are ideas as to life and conduct which are so manifestly false that the only morally permissible attitude for public opinion is one of uncompromising attack. But the method has its dangers, especially in the hands of those in a position to influence community thinking not by direct argument but by "playing up" facts which they wish to stress. A financial or political leader can talk facts and tell lies. That is to say, he can so arrange the strokes of emphasis upon the facts of a situation as to misinform honest readers and hearers. This may not be done with deliberate intent. It can be done out of prejudice or bias as certainly as out of selfishness. The danger is very great. In a democracy like ours there is too much acquiescence in what James Bryce calls "the fatalism of the majority"; too much confidence that when the people have passed upon a question they have passed upon it aright. The method of influence upon man's opinion must be used, but it must be used with a sense of heavy moral obligation to society, an obligation that recognizes that the subtlest form of

falsehood is that which so selects and arranges facts that without a single word of comment from an interpreter, the selection and arrangement may produce a false impression.

A worthy world view, an emphasis upon human values, an insistence upon moral obligation in the use of social method,—these all seem essential in our attempts to mark for good the new world order which is to come out of present strife. Men cannot create situations outright. The most they can hope for is to control the forces which work around them. The hour is one for emphasis upon the imperative necessity of right control. We must deal with facts as they are; but we must deal with these facts as they should be dealt with. In the old story of creation we are told that the first step toward the formation of order out of chaos came as the brooding spirit spoke light into being. The most this organization can hope to do is to contribute some measure of light. If we can make our conceptions of ideals and of values and of methods glow with light, our time will not have been spent in vain. If we can realize anew the necessity of so standing for ideals and emphasizing values and moralizing methods as to open up springs of spiritual liberty, our work will have positive worth.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

FRANCIS G. PEABODY, LL. D.
Professor Emeritus, Harvard University

I am to speak on "The Religious Education of an American Citizen," and I must begin by defining what these words, in my understanding of them, mean. By religious education I do not mean the acceptance of a theological system, or the concurrence in a traditional creed, or the learning by rote of a prescribed catechism, however important these may be. I mean the educating—or, as the word means, the drawing-out—of the religious nature, the clarifying and strengthening of religious ideals, the enriching and rationalizing of the sense of God. Religious education is therefore not to be imposed from without, but to be developed from within. It assumes the susceptibility and responsiveness of human life to the approaches of the Divine life, and by every influence of suggestion and environment clears the way by which the love of God seeks the soul of man. Education is thus, as Lessing affirmed, revelation,

the disclosure to the will of man of the will of God. Nor is this the whole of religious education. A life which has thus acquired a quickened and active sense of Divine control becomes inevitably associated with God's purpose for the world, so far as that may be revealed. Revelation passes over into dedication. The end of education is in service. The consciousness of God directs one's will to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. The life that is sanctified, becomes sanctified for others' sakes. The world which environs the individual life becomes the object of redemption. The daily prayer of a religiously educated life is not only: "Thy will be done," but not less, "Thy kingdom come."

And if this is religious education, what, on the other hand, is an American citizen? He is not merely one who has acquired the right to vote, or has a stake in the property of the nation or has been rescued from a condition of hyphenization. He is one who with the privileges has accepted the obligations of American citizenship. He finds in the conditions and opportunities of American democracy that sphere of personal and social action which is to him most congenial and welcome. An American citizen does not wish he were born under a monarchical or aristocratic or feudal system; he does not view the experimental imperfections of democracy with condescension or contempt; he prefers a civilization in the making to a civilization which is ready made, the risks of a rushing stream to the risks of a stagnant pool. Faith in democracy is the atmosphere in which he has been born and bred; or for the sake of that faith he has ventured across the sea. In the vast and seething melting pot of American civilization there is fulfilling itself, he believes, a mighty process through which the gold of national character is to be precipitated and the heterogeneous elements of American life are to be purified as by fire. If then he is to receive a religious education, it must be wrought out of these conditions of American citizenship. There must be no conflict of authority, no ecclesiastical law over-riding or obstructing national law. Religion is not to be reserved for days of worship only, or occasions of special need, and citizenship as a rule conducted as though there were no God of righteousness or love. Life must be integral and harmonious. The institutions of American citizenship, just as they are, with all their imperfections and blunders, must be the instruments of a religious life. If the Kingdom of God is to come in America it must come through the agencies of citizenship. To contribute to their stability and develope their possibilities is not only to be a loyal citizen, but at the same time to get a practical education

in religion. Patriotism and personality must thrive together. The freedom of citizenship must be a part of that religious loyalty whose service is perfect freedom.

But is this unity of experience attainable? Can there be any such identity of motives in citizenship and in religion? Are not the principles and practices of American life hopelessly removed from the ideal of a Kingdom of God? Is not family life among us disintegrated and declining; are not our business dealings degraded by brutality and fraud; is not our political life tainted by self-interest and partisanship; are not our international negotiations corrupted by tortuous diplomacy and broken pledges? What chance is there in such a soil for the growth and flowering of a religious life? How can one meet the problems of an American home, or make his living by the methods of American business, or tolerate the scheming of American politics, or see his country entering into the mighty rivalries of the World Powers, without frankly recognizing that the service of God has been abandoned for the service of Mammon, and the Kingdom of God supplanted by the kingdoms of this world? Must not a choice be made between religious education and American citizenship? If one would lead a consistently religious life, must he not separate himself from the normal conduct of the modern world as the saints of the Middle Ages fled from the corruption of their time to the spiritual security of monastic cells? Has not the tragic history of the past three years demonstrated that the way to security and success, either for a citizen or a nation, leads to an end where the ideals of equity and mercy are no longer within the horizon of practical affairs, and where from dreams of a Utopia of faith and prayer one is rudely waked into a Godless world?

It must be candidly admitted that many signs of the present time go far to justify this scepticism. The colossal tragedy which is overwhelming Europe, and the hardly less demoralizing consequences of commercial inflation and moral neutrality in this country, are putting an unprecedented strain on the faith of the idealist, and are encouraging the prophets of a degenerate and materialized world. The institution of the Family, we are told, has become little more than the survival of a pleasant and primitive fiction. The business world has become a scene of war, where great alliances of wage-earners attack the central powers of capital in their trenches of privilege; and as for political life, whether local, national, or international, there is, it is said, no law but force, no strength but in numbers, no peace but through power, and no permanent escape from the present hell. It is a good time, therefore, to examine

once more these pillars of our civilization, and to consider whether they are thus tottering in decay. It is quite true that the easy optimism which satisfied many minds before the cyclone of war swept down upon the world is no longer a practicable philosophy. The cheerful song of Pippa is no longer heard:

"God's in His heaven,
All's right with the world."

But is it true that the terrific events which have laid this easy faith in ruins have swept away with it the whole structure of idealism, as though the cyclone were a deluge from which no dry land was ever to emerge? Is it certain that the pillars of a good world are crumbling? Must civilization be reconstructed on a new and untried plan? Has American citizenship parted company forever from religious education; and has the world lost not only millions of precious lives, but also its still more precious soul?

On the contrary, even if one looks at things just as they are, and accepts without evasion the solemn challenge of the time, there meet him, in the very institutions of citizenship which appear to be so gravely threatened, the conditions of rational faith and the instruments of national character. It is not that the material of a religious education has been destroyed, but that it has in large degree been undiscovered. It is not that the pillars of our social order are rotten, but that they have not been tested. It is not, Mr. Chesterton has lately said, that Christianity has been tried and found wanting, it is that it has been found difficult and never tried. It is not, as many believe, that in a time like this there is nothing left of religion, but on the contrary, that in a time like this there is nothing but religion left.

Let us recall once more the social institutions which create the environment of American citizenship, and observe their nature and effect. Each when closely examined exhibits a twofold character, and the anxious or sceptical critic may be easily confused or misled. Each has its external defects and disasters, but each in its interior character is a witness of the motives of idealism and depends on these motives for stability and permanence. The institution of the Family, for example, is, it is true, threatened by lightmindedness and lust. One marriage in twelve in the United States is shattered by divorce. Yet, on the other hand, nothing is more obvious than the ethical significance and the unparalleled effect on citizenship of the normal type of family life in the United States. If it is true that one union in twelve is broken, it is not less true that eleven out of twelve survive. If it is true that the Family is often corrupted

by commercialism and self-interest, it is not less true that it is much oftener perpetuated by unconstrained and self-effacing love. An epidemic of social disease should not obscure the more prevalent condition of general social health. All competent observers, whether from Europe or from the Orient, agree in the conclusion that the domestic type evolved from the conditions of American civilization is a unique contribution to the moral education of the race, and that a free democracy finds its original and clearest expression in the free union of partners through mutual affection and restraint. In this fertile soil of the American Family the religious education of a citizen begins. In this relationship, first as child, then as husband or wife, and then as parent, the great majority of American citizens receive their first lesson in altruism and learn to sanctify themselves for others' sakes. Thus the immediate problem of the Family in American life is not one of criticism or apology or the devising of ways to escape from so antiquated a compulsion, but on the contrary, the problem of the utilization, simplification and safe-guarding of that union. The vitality of religion in the mature experience of citizens who must accept the stress and haste of American life is primarily dependent on the reality of the religion which they have acquired under the conditions of an uncorrupted, simple, natural and happy home. The Kingdom of God which is the end of religious education is nothing else than the realization of that social ideal whose germinal type is the normal Family. "Except ye turn," said Jesus, "and become like children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of God." It was a summons from the complexity and confusion of the world to the instincts and impulses which are naturally learned at a mother's knee; and this recall to the original sources of religious education the American citizen must turn to hear.

When one passes from the religious education provided by the home to the circumstances of industrial and commercial life in the United States at the present time, he is met by a still more convinced and passionate scepticism. Modern business, we are told, is nothing else than organized piracy. "There is no such thing," it is said, "as an ethical bargain. There are no honest goods to buy or sell. The hideous competitive war makes the industrial order seem like the triumph of hell and madness on earth. The business man who is not willing to be a wolf cannot remain in his business." Many signs of the business world unquestionably confirm this counsel of despair. The war between the rival forces of industry is often cruel and merciless, and the lust of gain on the one side is matched by reckless hate on the other. It is as hard as it was in the time of

Jesus Christ for those who trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God. The habit of acquisition easily becomes an insidious disease, and the hand which has become prehensile in its grasp grows paralyzed when it would open its palm. A time of inflated prosperity and reckless extravagance is called to hear once more the word of Jesus: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Must we however conclude that this great area of human conduct, in which the vast majority of American citizens necessarily pass most of their waking hours, provides no field for a religious education? On the contrary, the essential nature of business life is not, as is so freely affirmed, irretrievably base and sordid, but disciplinary, educative, and creative. In the form of productive effort, through agriculture, manufacture and the mechanic arts, business life is a vast organization of social service, existing to provide others with what they want; and in the form of finance or the exchange of values, business life is a still more elaborate organization of credit, existing through mutual integrity and good faith. It is sometimes fancied that a man is best equipped for business success by audacity, unscrupulousness and cunning. The truth is, however, that for one man who profits by luck or fraud, a thousand owe all they have gained to integrity and uncorruptibility. The profits of honorable persistency are the whole vastly greater than the profits of recklessness or fraud. Business life, in other words, just as it is, with all its solicitations to unscrupulousness, offers at least a fair chance for the religious education of an American citizen. Its temptations set one, it is true, as on a high mountain, where the kingdoms of this world lie at one's feet and the promise is heard, "All this will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me;" but it is as possible in America as it was in Palestine to answer, "Get thee behind me, Tempter!" and to turn from the passion for the kingdoms of this world to the much more persuasive passion for the Kingdom of God.

As one looks, then, at the opportunities of modern business now offered to sagacious and far-sighted Americans, the first impression which is made by the prevailing habit of mind in many men of business is not so much of its wickedness as of its stupidity. They are so pre-occupied with the chances of immediate profit or with the temporary contentions of commercial life that they do not see the new world of industrial opportunity which is even now knocking at their doors. They have not discovered that the labor question has been converted into a human question; that they must in future deal

not merely with mechanical processes but with the passions and desires of human beings; and that if they do not want bitterness and revolt, they must provide equity, fraternity and the right to a human life. Here is where business sagacity—not to say business sanity—now begins. It turns to schemes of industrial co-operation, conciliation, or partnership, not merely to escape the wastage of industrial war, but to organize production and distribution as a league to enforce industrial peace; not as a device of patronage but as an expression of fraternalism and justice. In other words, business stability in the future of American life is to be dependent in an unprecedented degree on a fresh accession of social responsibility and co-operative conscientiousness, and the man of business who commits himself to sound experimentation in this field of industrial fraternalism will find in his business career itself the material and the motives of a religious education.

When one passes, finally, from the problems of home and of business to the political conditions of this amazing and bewildering time, he is met by a still more tragic sense of maladjustment and confusion. In the wranglings of partisanship and the horrors of war, what is left, one asks himself, of the ideals of religion and the vision of a Kingdom of God? Has not government become a mere struggle for spoils, and diplomacy a mere game of gamblers? Have not the masses of citizens become mere pawns in that great game, and are not small principalities transferred from one great Power to another, as Lord John Russell once said, like firkins of butter passed from hand to hand? How can we talk of education in religion when we are really being educated in the art of slaughter, or lift up our thoughts to a heaven of peace when we are thrust down into a hell of war?

And yet, through the thick darkness of the present time, with its uninterpretable mysteries and its irremediable losses, one ray of light already reaches the stricken world and illuminates the tragic scene. Whatever else is still hidden in the shadows of an unexplored future, this at least has already become plain—that through the suffering and sorrow of the time, and its daily summons to face the supreme demands of life and death, there is occurring in all nations a vast process of religious education; and that the sense of man's dependence and God's guidance is in a totally unprecedented degree becoming real and efficient in millions of lives. On this point the testimony both from the men in the trenches and from their trembling friends at home is beyond dispute. Much as has been lost, God, in a multitude of instances, has been found. Men who have been, as

they themselves believed, irretrievably enslaved by levity or self-indulgence, are finding themselves sobered, chastened, emancipated, and redeemed. Impulses and desires which they had thought outgrown with the clothes and sports of childhood, now re-assert themselves with a new authority, and the ideals of loyalty, sacrifice, contrition and devotion to the will of God, become clarified and compelling. These lives have been saved, yet so as by fire, and the fire is trying each man's work of what sort it is. Such a baptism by fire is not likely to be soon forgotten. Many aspects of religion, which have hitherto seemed important, will—we may be sure—no longer command from these lives even a lingering interest. The conflicts of sects, the claims of sacerdotalism, the elaboration of creeds, and the æstheticism of worship, which have so often pre-occupied the minds of theologians and ecclesiastics, will seem remote and unreal to men who have crouched in the trenches facing eternity and meditating on death.

It may even happen, as has been suggested, that many people will have to leave the Church in order to be Christians. Yet of the reality of religion itself, the communion of the soul with God, the renewal of faith through one supreme act of self-effacing loyalty—of all this there will be a new assurance; and those who have found in their terrific experiences a courage and patience and peace of mind unknown to them in peaceful days, may return from the front—if they do return at all—as missionaries return from the terrors of the jungle to teach their stay-at-home and unawakened brethren the elementary principles of a rational religious life. Only the other day an English soldier wrote of his companions at the front: "Of the Church in which I believe, they are members whether they know it or not; if they are not good men, I am a blasphemer. I shall never be satisfied until the Church of England is the Church of all good men and women in England, and until all the good thoughts and deeds in England are laid at the feet of the Lord of all good life;" and, still more lately, an English author, whose extraordinary gifts have often been tainted by sensualism and cynicism, has testified to his own discovery of God through the solemn experience of these illuminating years. "I believe," writes Mr. H. G. Wells, "that only through a complete simplification of religion to its fundamental idea, to a world-wide realization of God as the king of the heart and of all mankind, * * * can mankind come to any certain security and happiness. * * * I conceive myself to be thinking as the world thinks, and if I find no great facts, I find a hundred little indications to reassure me that God comes.

Even those who have neither the imagination nor the faith to apprehend God as a reality will, I think, realize presently that the Kingdom of God over a world-wide system of republican states is the only possible formula under which we may hope to unify and save mankind." What is this extraordinary confession of a mind completely alienated from organized Christianity, but a testimony to a religious education, a cleansing of motives and a vision of service, which—as they are realized in millions of lives—may in the end make these years of tragedy, if not wholly interpretable or atoned for, at least an epoch of spiritual revival and rational faith? And if this is what can happen through the blood-stained ministry of war, may it not conceivably happen through a more complete understanding of the nature and problems of a world at peace? Must we wait to stand in the immediate presence of death before we can learn how to live? Is physical carnage the only way to spiritual courage? Is God to be found nowhere but in the trenches? Or is it possible that the religious education which has been wrought out of the disasters of war may be perpetuated and re-inforced among the not less difficult problems of the world that is to be? Shall we not emerge from this eclipse of faith into a saner, simpler, and more convincing type of religion? Must the lessons of soldierliness be learned in an era of destruction alone, or may one amid the more subtle perils of a reconstructed world become a good soldier of Jesus Christ?

That is the solemn question which confronts modern civilization as it begins to grope its way through the present horror to the problems that lie beyond the war. "A complete simplification of religion," "an assurance that God comes," "a Kingdom of God over a world-wide system of republican states,"—this formula, by which "we may hope to unify and save mankind" is not for armies and navies alone to teach, but for consecrated citizenship to verify by experience. This is what religion is to mean in the world that is at our doors, and in contributing to this universal end must be fulfilled the religious education of each American citizen.

PEACE AND WORLD ORDER

JAMES H. KIRKLAND, LL.D.

Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

It is a mere truism to say that world order is to-day only a dream. For two and a half years the world has watched the destruction of its choicest possessions—human life, property, and all the accumulations of civilization. We have seen states go down in utter collapse. At first men cried out in horror—the thing was too ghastly to be true. Now human feeling has reached its limit. We are stupefied, not horrified. All that nerves can suffer has been endured and the end is not yet. Just as men had begun to talk about peace, just as this government, speaking through our President, began to initiate plans for the discussion of terms of peace, a new fury is lent to the flames and we are enveloped in their consuming wrath. Chaos and ruin take a new start.

It is not unworthy of notice that during this period of war individual nations have given marked exhibitions of patriotic fervor, of social organization and constructive power. Divisions have been healed, differences adjusted. German socialists have become militarists; the Irish have enlisted in the English army, militant suffragists have declared a truce with society, religious discussions have ceased in France and persecutions relaxed in Russia. Everywhere each people has come together with one mind and heart. Moral reforms have been easy. Temperance has been enthroned as the law of normal living. Social disorder has been unknown. States have been organized and mobilized as armies. Never before has physical struggle been carried on with so much intellectual and moral power. And yet with all that, no adequate result is as yet attained. We have had wonderful national development but world ruin. Furthermore, the intensity of the struggle does not justify any expectation that a lasting solution of national differences can be found on the field of battle.

Some adjustment of the differences between contending nations might be reached if the issues were more sharply defined, but no general agreement exists as to why the world order was disturbed. When the United States entered on its great struggle in 1861 there was no uncertainty as to the issues; it was union against disunion, it was slavery against emancipation. The world is familiar with religious wars, incited by ecclesiastical divisions, stimulated by religious bitterness, but this is no religious war. The Greek church of Russia is bound to the Roman church of Italy; Catholics of

Austria are fighting Catholics of France and Belgium; and Protestants of England are fighting Protestants of Germany. The world has seen wars fostered by racial antipathies and disputes. But now Bulgarian and Turk fight side by side; Russian and Japanese are friends and allies; while English and German hate each other with the accumulated passion of a nation's fury.

In the midst of this confusion of issues, the warring nations have been most diligent in presenting the righteousness of their claims, and in endeavoring to put on their antagonists the responsibility for beginning the war. This effort attests the increasing power of public opinion and the weight now attaching to the moral judgments of mankind. It is not a matter of indifference or unimportance how we approach the consideration of this question. If we are to strive for the restoration of order, we must form some judgment as to the causes of its universal overthrow. To that inquiry let us now address ourselves briefly.

We now come to the great cause which has been assigned in explanation of the present war. It is the all but universal opinion of England and a view of the case largely current in America that this is a war of ideas, a strife between two forms of culture. Mr. H. G. Wells puts the matter as follows: "All the realities of this war are things of the mind. This is a conflict of cultures, and nothing else in the world. All the world-wide pain and weariness, fear and anxieties, the bloodshed and destruction, the innumerable torn bodies of men and horses, the stench of putrefaction, the misery of hundreds of millions of human beings, the waste of mankind, are but the material consequences of a false philosophy and foolish thinking. We fight not to destroy a nation but a nest of evil ideas." The supporters of this view point to the constitution of the German government, to the words and deeds of the Kaiser, to his claims of a divine right over his fellows, his denunciation of 3,000,000 of his subjects as traitors, his overbearing attitude toward his own people and the rest of the world, to the dominant military party that is in complete control of the nation, to the changes in foreign policy since the passing of Bismarck, the development of colonial ambitions, a great navy, the call for a place in the sun, the invention of Pan-Germanism, the patronage of Turkey, the bid for Moslem leadership, the ambitious efforts to establish supreme authority from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, to the challenge of the Monroe Doctrine, to the teachings of Bernhardi, of Trietschke, of Nietzsche, or others to the effect that might makes right, that war is necessary and desirable, that efforts toward its abolition are unworthy and im-

moral, that the end all and be all of a state is power and he who is not man enough to look this truth in the face should not meddle with politics, that the state's highest moral duty is to increase its power, that the state is the sole judge of its action, that whatever is necessary is moral. The supporters of this view point for confirmation of their judgments to the manner in which Germany has conducted the war, to the violation of Belgium, to faith broken again and again with her people, to endless cruelty and barbarity, to the use of poisonous gases, to the sinking of the Lusitania, to the murder of hundreds of thousands of Armenians, to the deportation into slavery of men, women and children from Poland, from France, and from Belgium, and, latest of all, to death without warning with which the neutral world is threatened. These are the things that have made the German government the most hated of the world. To students and scholars who have known and loved another Germany, the Germany of scientific attainment, of social organization, of poetry, music and art, of rare love of the beautiful in nature, of kindness and human friendship, the co-existence of these two national characters in one people is the riddle of all riddles.

It is not the purpose of this paper to try to establish the exact measure of responsibility in the different causes which have been given as underlying the present war. The purpose to which this argument now proceeds is to call attention to the fact that the final result of all these influences was the upbuilding of strong, antagonistic nationalities. In each case the end aimed at was the attainment of the greatest possible national power. Whether the things believed about others were true or false, right or wrong, the immediate effect was larger armaments, more soldiers, more ships, more ports, more naval bases, more flying machines, more submarines. As this expansion of power reached national limits it was increased by alliances. Diplomatic rivalries antedated by years the struggle of the battlefield. States not included in such alliances were regarded as possible enemies, to be feared and to be hated. Force was the only basis of national power and the only ultimate solution of problems. Preparedness was the only guarantee of peace, but preparedness was always relative not absolute; it meant a little more power than any rival possessed. Preparedness was not only military, but educational and economic. In this way militaristic conceptions dominated the whole life of the state, and poisoned its very dreams. As expressed by Professor Mussey, "This ideal has filled the vision of kings and princes; at times it has snatched up whole peoples in wild delirium of conquest and imperialism. It is subtle,

cunning, cruel. Actually a thing of feeling, it knows how to clothe itself in all the panoply of thought. It deceives even trained thinkers, who gravely and honestly discuss the economic well-being of their own people or even the welfare of humanity, when in reality their deepest-lying motive is national aggrandizement. When this ideal stalks abroad in its nakedness, we denounce it as militarism; but when it wraps itself cunningly in a smooth covering of biological analogies and economic half-truths, we admire it as a wonderful scientific theory. And it is the bitterest foe to the ideal of well-being; for it means inevitably struggle for dominance, and ultimately war."

And so we are led finally to the conclusion that world strife has come out of the dominance of identical systems. This war is not so much a conflict of ideals as an identity of ideals and a conflict of interests. As Dr. Fried puts it, "This war in which we are to-day engulfed is the logical outcome of the kind of peace which preceded it. We did not have true peace. What we are experiencing with horror to-day is only the conclusion of a process to which the present generation has become accustomed, the inevitable outcome of that condition of latent war which grew out of the lack of adjustment to the natural course of evolution, and made anarchy dominant." This does not include all nations alike in one universal judgment. It does not make impossible discrimination and awards of blame. But it is opposed to that easy disposition that puts all the blame on one party and lets others go free.

More important still, this conviction of universal guilt suggests the line of approach of the coming world order. The world congress that will convene for the settlement of this great war will have many hard questions to dispose of—definite questions of boundaries, of national relationships, of readjustments. We cannot now see or suggest how these matters may be worked out. But the greatest question of all, the one in which the whole world is interested, is the establishment of universal order, the setting up of peace under lasting guarantees. If the error of the past has been the upbuilding of nations as rival units, the correction of that error will be the recognition of a larger whole whose interests are to be secured and guaranteed by co-operation. The evolution of society must not be strangled by artificial political lines, but must proceed to something that approaches a world organization.

It is not necessary now to work out a definite program. Every such plan is open to attack. It is easy to say that America will not bind herself to go to war to enforce the judgments of Russian and

Austrian commissioners concerning some Greco-Turkish complication. It is also easy to say that no nation will allow a Federation of Europe to be set up exercising such superior rights as are now exercised in the United States by the Federal Government as against the various states. It is also easy to say that the efforts after the wars of Napoleon to establish a permanent concert of Europe were unsuccessful and came to naught. But it is the counsel of despair to say that the world has learned nothing in one hundred years. The world is indeed bereft of moral character if no remedy can be found for a state of society universally recognized as intolerable. On July 30, 1914, Sir Edward Grey wrote, "If the peace of Europe can be preserved and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately." What was impossible in 1914 may be possible in the near future. Here is something greater than a larger place in the sun or even a world empire. Let not America withhold her participation or her influence through any allegiance to outgrown political theories or misdirected traditions. Perhaps we are come to our kingdom of influence and power for such a time as this.

Something is gained if we recognize well in advance the supreme obligation of the present crisis, and the greatness of the task which challenges the intelligence and character of the world.

Finally, we must be reminded that only the first step in a program of world order will be taken by diplomacy at the conclusion of present hostilities. What is done will necessarily be an experiment, it will point the way, it will register a hope.

But the efforts of diplomacy must be immediately followed by an educational crusade. Without this buttress and support the world structure cannot be erected. The educational system of Germany has not been in opposition to militarism but has supported its extremest teachings. "The Appeal to the Civilized World" from ninety-three German scholars and professors bases German civilization on military power. The greatest educational system in the world has been subservient to political exigency and has welded a nation into enthusiastic support of a fundamental error. And the tendency in other countries is to adopt and try to vitalize the same philosophy. As Norman Angell says, "A country at war is led by an almost mechanical process to adopt the very morality that it sets out to fight." The extremest views of Bernhardi may be paralleled in

quotations from recent French, English and American writers. Even Italy has not remained untouched by these heresies. Mr. T. L. Stoddard, writing in *The Forum* more than a year ago, says, "Few people realize the intensity of the movement which during the last few years has been transforming Italian thought. This movement, expansionist and aggressive to the highest degree, calls itself Nationalism, but is in reality a sublimated Imperialism."

To get rid of these errors will require more than a treaty, it will require a new enlightenment and a quickening of conscience. This means a new application of philosophy and ethics to world problems, and this application must be made in Germany as heartily, as sincerely and as faithfully as in England or France or the United States. Nothing short of this will reach the seat of a world-wide disorder. Momentary superiority of force may draw the boundary lines of opposing units, but if we are to establish peace and world order, universal human intelligence must seek it by deliberate choice, and universal effort must be centered on fashioning a new world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MIND

REV. JOHN HOWARD MELISH, D.D.

Rector, Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn

When Andrew D. White retired from public life he gave a notable address at Harvard on the foreign policy of the United States. Before an audience of young Americans that crowded Sanders Theatre, the distinguished ambassador and publicist declared the day had come when this country must abandon its policy of splendid isolation. America finds herself in a world transformed by steam and electricity. She is doing business upon seas policed by the British fleet. She is selling goods in continents opened by French and Germans and Dutch. The modern world is also witnessing a commerce of the mind. Science, literature and art transcend national boundaries and create a citizenship of the world. In such a world, Mr. White asserted, America could not, and had no moral right to, continue its policy of isolation. The change of policy involved problems of magnitude and tasks most difficult of successful

accomplishment; but they must be faced. "Young men," exclaimed the speaker as his final word, "Let us not lose faith in the Republic."

That speech, coming from such a man at the close of his distinguished career, compelled his youthful hearers, from that moment on, to think internationally. For multitudes of minds, beyond college yards and in the ranks of wage earners, socialism has been a liberal education in internationalism. Since the days of the Communist Manifesto, increasing numbers of men and women in all nations have crossed their national boundaries. The call went out, "Working men of the World, Unite!" In all European nations before the war, by means of soap-box orator and penny tract and study class, socialism was at work, like leaven in a barrel of meal, creating an international mind.

Religion, no less than politics and economics, has been a factor in international education. In Judaism before the Christian era some few prophetic minds thought in terms of humanity. Jesus of Nazareth was an internationalist. He crossed the boundary between Judea and Samaria, in defiance of the religious prejudices of His day, and recognized the good Samaritan. In His spirit Paul became an apostle to the Gentiles, and laid down the international principle that in Christ there cannot be Greek or Jew, barbarian or Scythian. The Primitive Catholic Church was, in ideal and aim, a world order inclusive of all nations and tongues and peoples. Modern missions has caught the vision of the world and is at work for mankind. To-day there are increasing numbers of religious minds who can say with Phillips Brooks, "The longer I live the more strongly the idea of humanity takes possession of me, not a portion of humanity, not a selection out of humanity, but man in his deepest interests, in his spiritual possibilities."

When the European war broke as a devastating hurricane, all these forces making for an international mind suffered shipwreck. World commerce and finance, it was said, would prevent any such catastrophe; but they were twisted out of all shape and thrown aside as play-things. Socialism, it was claimed, would call a general strike in Germany and France, if the militarists and diplomats dared to precipitate a conflict; but, when the bugles sounded a war of defense, wage-earners as well as capitalists, joined the colors. Religion saw its missionaries hurry home from the outlying sections of the earth where they had worked as comrades, and throw themselves into their respective national armies as belligerents. We are living in a world which, temporarily at least, has been blown to pieces by high explosives and torn by shrapnel. And yet, out of the crash of

the modern world there is bound to come a more stately mansion of the international mind.

To build this stately mansion of the soul of man what shall religious education do? I desire to offer three positive suggestions and two negative.

I. CREATE FAITH IN WORLD ORDER

Religious education should create *faith* in a world order.

There is only one earth. Mankind cannot annex Mars or extend its sway to Saturn. Therefore the children of God must either learn to dwell together upon the Father's home-acre or drive each other off of it. There are those who think that, whatever our hopes and prayers, population and food supply will make the decision. Julius Cæsar relates that the Germans crossed the Rhine because of their numbers, the need of food and the desire for culture. However justifiable the invasion of Gaul was in 45 B.C. an invasion of Gaul was not justifiable in 1914, because modern industrialism makes it possible for millions to live where agriculture could support only thousands. It is also asserted that this very industrialism is the cause of wars between nations. A manufacturing nation must get and keep markets for its products. The need of markets sends it into the world to compete with other manufacturing nations. That competition creates friction, which if prolonged bursts into flame. The cause of the present war was not a brutal murder but the tariff discrimination of Austria against Serbia. Men who see these things, shake their heads sadly when world peace is mentioned, and, reluctantly persuade themselves that it is the part of wisdom to prepare for future wars. But why should we despair? Are commercial tariffs ordained of God? Is modern capitalism rooted in the nature of things?

As industrialism makes possible the life of millions in a limited territory, so a revolutionized industrialism, maintained not for exploitation but for service, makes possible the durable peace of the world.

Religious education should train men to believe that whatever is needed for the good of men is obtainable. Every onward step man has taken since the days of the anthropoid ape has been taken in the face of the objections that "the facts are against it and human nature cannot be changed." The ideal society is ever saying to humanity, "Create me." And the men of faith have accepted the invitation. Faith is that which removes mountains and makes all things new.

II. FAITH IN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Religious education not only should create faith in a world order but it should create faith in *righteousness* as the basis of the ideal world order.

Europe knows what it means to base the union of nations upon hypocrisy and falsehood. It has seen diplomats sign an agreement among nations, which presumably expressed their thought and purpose, and then with the same ink sign a private treaty by which all the stipulations of the agreement were to be ignored. America knows what it means to ignore treaty obligations and seize a strip of territory on the ground that we are righteous and all others are scoundrels and grafters. George Washington declared in his farewell address that religion and morality, no less than good policy, bade his countrymen to observe good faith and justice toward all nations. "Who can doubt," said he, "that in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it?"

What a gigantic task it is to persuade men to be willing to do the right though the heavens fall! For every ninety-nine men out of a hundred Decatur's toast is true in international relations. "My Country, may it ever be right. But, right or wrong, my Country!" Religion's moral task is to educate the mind to say, "My Country, may it ever be right. But when it is wrong, I will do my bit to make it right!" What sacrifices such a decision involves, we can appreciate in this day of war and rumors of war. The whole world is praising the heroism and devotion of the gallant men who out under the stars are facing the reality and tragedy of conflict. And they deserve honor. But I want to bear the tribute of admiration to those nameless heroes in various countries who are suffering ignominy, humiliation and imprisonment because they have chosen to serve a higher cause than the Germany or England of to-day, the cause of righteousness, fraternity and truth. They serve their nations best who serve righteousness first.

III. SERVICE

Religious education should train the international mind to *serve*. In his words of golden counsel to his countrymen, Washington bade them cultivate peace and harmony with all nations. "In the execution of such a plan," he said, "nothing is more essential than that antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated." There have been

moments in the last thirty months when many Americans have seemed to ignore this advice. We honor the German in our midst for his love of the fatherland. We respect the Englishman, sojourning among us, for his loyalty to the British Empire. But by the same test we demand that during this European conflict, whatever their inveterate antipathies or their passionate attachments, the citizens of this nation shall put America first. "The nation," says Washington, "which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosities or its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interests."

To throw ourselves into an European conflict, under the impulse of antipathy or passionate attachment, would inextricably entangle our country in the politics of other nations. To lay down the principles of a world order upon which we would be willing to unite with other nations for the service of all, as President Wilson has effectively done, is, it seems to me, to serve the world. To enter upon that difficult task with clear heads and unselfish hearts is to perform what Washington calls "our duty to mankind," which is unavoidable and universal. Religion declares that our life is for service. Better that we should perish than that we should continually dwell in suspicion and fear of other nations. Infinitely better that we should perish than that we should cause others to dwell continually in suspicion and fear of us. If in the hour of peace America could bring herself to give for the rehabilitation and reconciliation of the nations now at war, the billions she has voted for battleships and armies, do you not believe that it would be the most effective and successful preparedness measure ever undertaken by man? "Millions for defense," once cried a patriot, "not a cent for tribute!" Millions for service, and you will not need a cent for defense.

If religion is to educate the international mind to *believe*, to do *righteousness* and to *serve* in the future it must cast off at least two of its inheritances from the past.

We must expurgate our prayers. A little English girl wrote a letter to her aunt in this country in which she said, "I pray every night for my dear papa at the front. I ask God to keep him safe and to kill all those wicked Germans." Little German girls are doubtless praying God to save their dear papas, and to kill all those wicked Englishmen. And little Italian girls are praying God to save their dear papas and to kill all those wicked Austrians. And little Austrian girls are praying God to save their papas and to kill all those wicked Italians. And the dear God hears all the prayers of

His children—the prayers to kill and maim their enemies! And even churches in solemn convention assembled have adopted prayers almost as far removed from the spirit of Him who said, "I say unto you, love your enemies and do good unto them that hate you." If we are to pray to the God of battles, to the Lord of armed hosts, let us address him by his proper name, not Our Father but Mars or Moloch. And let us present our petitions to kill our enemies, in the name of Julius Caesar, not Jesus Christ.

Our religious language needs to be expurgated of military imagery. At least so far as it applies to all our relations to others. Must we not substitute ideals of peaceful heroism for ideals of warlike heroism? St. Paul used the illustration of the soldier for the struggle of the man for right living and made it respectable. The church made use of the soldier metaphor when the great heroes were soldiers. That time has gone. The teacher, the thinker, the explorer, the inventor, the worker, the preacher, the physician and the nurse are all finer types of the hero and patriot than the soldiers, and yet we go on singing, "Onward, Christian Soldiers." Jesus never used a military figure. The woman in her home, the fisherman at his hazardous trade, the merchant taking risks, the farmer in his field, the carpenter at his job, the shepherd in the hills—these furnished Jesus with the imagery of spiritual life. Let us put this imagery into the worship of One who said, "Blessed are the peace makers." Let us strike out of the baptismal office, "Fight manfully under His banner" and insert, "Work faithfully for His cause."

It is such things—prayers and hymns and imagery—that mould the mind, far more than a course in international relations once in his career, and determine the future conduct of the child. "Every child is born a savage," says Dr. Morton Prince, "he only acquires culture and the common ideals and the common will of the social conscience." Let religion see to it that he acquires nothing but the best.

Across the fair earth have marched and countermarched throughout the centuries the merciless armies of world conquest. Nineveh and Babylon, cultured Greece and majestic Rome, the Turk, the Teuton and the Celt, the Anglo-Saxon, Slav and Japanese have each in turn drenched the world in blood. Dante pictured violence as punished in a river of boiling blood which flowed in a vast circle around hell. For glory, honor and loot the violent have encircled the world with a river of blood. In these latter days multitudes, baptized as Christians, civilized as men, have gone forth to kill for duty, to fight for justice, and to murder in defense of

country. Shall we not reverse the order of the world and send men forth to serve mankind? Would that from this day we might begin to raise a goodly fellowship of men and women, strong in soul and brave—"to dare, to do, to help and to endure."

They would go forth with hands quick to find, to soothe, to bless. Year by year their numbers would increase. And then in time—in God's good time—they would reveal the secret of eternal harmony—the reconciliation of the world.

RELIGIOUS TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL STUDIES

THE RELATION OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING TO MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

ERNEST CARROLL MOORE, PH.D.

Professor, Harvard University

A recent report of the United States Commissioner of Education contains the statement that "the vocationalizing of education remains the dominant note of the year. It will probably continue to be of paramount importance for many years, since the vocational movement in its larger aspects bears such vital relation to the whole problem of widening democracy." There can be no question that this movement is on. It has two forms, one, the movement for definite vocational or trade or occupational training, the other a much larger movement to make education of all sorts definitely and specifically preparatory for the life that the student will lead by making that life the basis of his education throughout. Anyone who reads the most interesting educational paper which comes to my table—the Educational Supplement of the London *Times*—will not be long in discovering that this current of educational change is running far more rapidly in England just now than it is in America. That education must be modernized by being made so practical that it will fit men and women to cope with the every day affairs of life is as definite a conviction over there as that England must win the war. If our nation becomes involved in the war it will come out of it with many times more interest in practical education than it now has. In short the world seems to have entered upon an educational renaissance far more important and more wide reaching than any educational revival through which it has yet passed. We live at one of those great times when old things are rapidly passing away and all things are being made new.

In reply to the question whether or not this insurging of practicalizing education may not interfere with the idealistic training of the young, my answer is unqualifiedly, no. On the contrary it is certain to do for us what education has by no means done in the past, it is certain to make idealism common. In one of their conversations Goethe warns Eckermann that to attempt to realize the ideal is vain and futile, for not that, but to idealize the real, is our problem. Now this whole vocationalizing effort has no other purpose than to help folks to idealize the real.

I used to be a teacher in a missionary school for the children of ex-slaves in the midst of the black belt in the south. Ours was a school with a strong preference for the classical type of studies; there were newer studies there but they were not received gladly. We taught reading for the sake of reading, writing for the sake of writing, and spelling for the sake of spelling without for a moment doubting that these abstract and unrelated activities would somehow make themselves into tools and get themselves used by the poor little befuddled, deceived, and pompous graduates of our school. And after we had taught them reading and its fellow studies, without teaching them how to use them, we gave them copious instruction in English grammar which they could not understand, and United States history which was so abstract and unrelated to anything they had seen or had any part in, that most of it was meaningless to them. The hardihood of the few who were not utterly discouraged by this course of study we next tried to break by setting them to wrestle with the Latin grammar. Two or three who had persevered in that course as far as Cicero's Orations we felt had not had enough grammar yet, so we set them to memorizing the Greek grammar. The money to provide this education was collected dollar by dollar and almost penny by penny from hard-working, pious folks whose hearts bled for the suffering poor and who as they listened with rapt attention to the persuasive missionary's account of how education was being brought to an oppressed race, taxed themselves heavily, shared their living and frequently gave more than they could afford that these poor colored children might have the unutterable blessing of an education. And we teachers used that money and took years of the time of those young people and sent them out into the world knowing nothing, able to teach chemical definitions and formulae to others, but wholly unable to use chemistry in farming, able to classify flowers but not to grow crops, able to pass a verbal examination on a book in physics, but quite unskilled in working with machines. Some of

them left with ideals such as that they should be clean, should not steal, should be men and women of their word, should work hard and be honest, but these ideals did not come from what they studied. They came from association with devoted people, devoted even though they were teaching the wrong studies and teaching them in the worst of ways.

A few miles away in another state, a colored teacher who knew his people and their needs far better than we did, with an intuition amounting to genius, discerned a truth that we must all in time discern and created a school to teach colored men and women to work. He taught them useful trades and forms of handiwork, and as essential parts of these skilled industries he taught them how to use their ability to read, to write and spell and employ calculation. He set before them the ideal of service. Learning, he said, which does not help you to produce something which men want, to act and live in such a way that men seeing your good works will value and honor you, is empty learning. You are to be citizens in a great, free, co-operative country. Your first duty is to learn to do your part, and if you do that, all other things will be added unto you. That educational reformer as everybody knows was Booker Washington (may his name be praised!) He lived to transform the education of the colored race. In place of an abstract and formal schooling, he gave them a genuine training for the work they are to do. In place of an abstract and conventional morality and religion, he taught them a concrete morality and religion. In place of unrelated ideas, he gave them purposes and taught them to use ideas in attaining them. In place of offering them ideals from books and the aspirations of other men, he taught them to develop their own ideals and to aspire themselves.

Emerson warns us to look out when God looses a thinker in this world. The work which this humble educational thinker did is bound to transform almost everything which schools and teachers do. It showed conclusively that the New England type of education must give way to a better kind of education in the South. It is now showing that the New England type of education must give way to a better kind in New England and in the whole United States. There are few happenings in the history of men more unexpected and astonishing than that the colored race within a single generation after it was freed from slavery should have taught the white race how to train up its children. A critic of education had to grow up outside the treadmill of education in order to put the proper value upon what is being done and to point

out ways of doing better. The most striking experience I have yet had in this incarnation was to meet and talk with the Buddhist monk, Dharmapala, and to hear from his own lips that he had come to America in order to take back to India a man sufficiently familiar with the work of Booker Washington to establish a school similar to that of Tuskegee in the ancient city of Benares. That school was started. Surely nothing more dramatic has anywhere happened than that the best and most saintly representative of the oldest of all civilizations should seek the help of the best of the last of all the races to become civilized, in the education of his people.

My own difficulty is not at all due to concern lest the young may lack an idealistic training if they are instructed in practical studies and given what is called a vocational education. My difficulty is that I cannot comprehend how any other kind of education ever came to be given. How did it happen that anything but that which prepares men for their work ever came to be regarded as education? Must not all education be vocational? If we follow Aristotle's advice to study things in their origin we get great illumination upon this problem. Palæolithic man, if he taught his child anything, must have taught him to do the things which he had found indispensable, to chip stone implements and to hunt with their aid. Whatever education there was in that early time was clearly vocational, and vocational it remained at Sparta and at Athens too, for reading and music and gymnastics were the means to that democratic citizenship which the ability to read Solon's laws, to understand the Homeric morality, and to defend the state against the Persians made possible. When the Sophists introduced higher education into Greece they came offering to teach the arts of life or how to succeed in public and private affairs. One of them, Gorgias, believed and taught that but one thing was needful. All should learn it. The person who wanted to be a physician he urged to learn how to make speeches rather than to study medicine, and the man who wanted to become a general he said should study speech-making rather than military tactics. But Socrates corrected this error and spent his life in telling the Athenians that they must learn civic and manly virtue in just the same way that they learned to make shoes or pilot ships.

The teachers should direct the children's inclinations and interests to their final aim in life, and of all these aims that of being a good citizen and a good man is the greatest; this, according to Plato, is an art in which one is to gain skill in distinguishing good from evil, true from false, noble from ignoble, by what he does just

as the carpenter learns his trade or the farmer his. Cleanthes tells us that Socrates "cursed as impious him who first separated the just from the useful." That knowledge is virtue was the one doctrine that he taught. To him all knowledge was practical and, as I read him, all knowledge was practical to Plato also.

It was Aristotle who introduced confusion, first, by distinguishing a liberal education from an education fit for slaves; a distinction which the world mistakenly tries to maintain after slavery has gone out of existence; and, secondly, by separating theoretical knowledge from practical knowledge—*theoretical knowledge*, as he put it, being knowing just for the sake of knowing, knowing wholly unmixed with volition, and practical knowledge, knowing for the sake of doing. Is there any such thing as knowing unmixed with volition? At any rate the lecture notes of Aristotle's instruction show us that he gave great attention to practical knowledge. Roman education was practical throughout, and education in the dark ages, the lesser renaissance, and the greater renaissance, was throughout a specific preparation for what those who studied intended to do. Reformation education was intensely practical, specifically preparatory for the chief work of man. When the learning of the past had been translated into everyday speech it seemed to a good many thinkers of that day that the study of Greek and Latin should be given up and that the real things about men should be studied instead of the languages. The realists had the best of the argument until about 1750 certain German teachers of the old subjects began to defend their retention in the schools by declaring that though Latin and Greek are no longer practical since what we study in them is no longer useful, they must be pursued because they develop the powers or faculties of the mind. Thus the doctrine of formal or general education came into being and for a long time wholly supplanted specific education, which was the only kind of education which had existed for two thousand years.

The man who objects to the onrushing present day movement to make education specific throughout and definitely preparatory to the work of life does so for one, or perhaps more than one, of three reasons. He either follows Aristotle as against Socrates and Plato, and declares that knowledge exists for the sake of knowledge, science for the sake of science and learning for the sake of learning, or he holds to the doctrine of formal discipline and believes that there are some studies which improve the mind and perfect its powers and which are therefore indispensable while we are getting

an education, though we cannot after we leave school use them. Or he fears that making education definitely practical will result in such a narrowing of the course of study which each student pursues that nothing but one-sided training will result, and therefore prefers the old confused, aimless and unjustifiable education solely because he believes it requires the student to study more different subjects than the proposed arrangement will require. There is a fourth reason which some men give for their preference for the old studies. It is that they give the student hard work and lots of it, but this justification of them overlooks the fact that the new studies provide plenty of work too and have the advantage of permitting the student to understand why he does it.

The person who objects to practical studies because he believes in knowledge for its own sake is an intellectualist and must reckon with the pragmatists. His philosophy of learning seems to be unsound. There is no warrant in psychology or in history for such a position, and the phrases he uses seem to have no meaning. Literature, science, philosophy are all things which man has created. It is idolatry for the creator to worship the things which he has made. They are all tools or instruments which the young must learn to use and work with, but not ends in themselves. It is as sensible to say that hammers exist for the sake of hammers as to say that literature exists for the sake of literature, mathematics for the sake of mathematics, and science for the sake of science. They all exist for man's sake and for no other reason. There is a very great advantage in giving up spelling for the sake of spelling, geography for the sake of geography, and literature for the sake of literature. Just as soon as we take the view that we learn to spell in order that we may spell the words which we shall need to spell when we write, our task becomes so definite and manageable that we can accomplish it, while so long as we learn to spell words just because words are spelled, there are so many of them which are spelled that we do not learn to spell them with any degree of success. The same limiting and defining of our task takes place in all the other subjects.

The man who believes that the business of education is to perfect or at least improve the faculties of the mind will have to reckon with the psychologists who declare with one accord that there are no faculties of the mind. He will have to make his peace with such men as Professor Spearman who declares that "the great assumption upon which education has rested for so many centuries is now at last rendered amenable to experimental corroboration—and it proves to be false!" The more he studies this intricate subject the

more convinced he will become that a philosophy of education cannot be made out of the doctrine of formal discipline, that all education is definitely and thoroughly specific. We cannot longer take the years of children in order to train them in accordance with a theory which has proven to be unsound. All life is a doing and all real education is learning to do certain things which neither the student nor his fellows can get along without.

If any person thinks that specific or practical education cannot be of as many kinds as are necessary to prepare the student to do all the several sorts of acts which he as a moral person, good citizen, member of a family, social and industrial producer, and trustful child of God must do, he must have reckoned but indifferently with the dictum of the psychologist that "it is impossible to keep up an interest unless it be specific" and that the specific interests which unite us to our fellows may each and all of them be fostered and trained in the school. The fact which we must reckon with is that the old general education of the faculty-developing sort does not foster but depresses them.

One of my colleagues whose interest in the mental life of students is exceptionally acute, tells me that he is convinced that our present requirement that certain studies must be pursued for reasons which the student cannot comprehend, nor can we ourselves for that matter, and which the student spends his years upon in an aimless fashion, leaves him mentally disorganized and ambitionless at the end of his course. His idealism is gone, he distrusts his own powers and he faces the world in a dejected and despairing condition. The school and college instead of fitting him to take part in the battle of life, have unfitted him to do that. The conclusion is clear: studies must take the life form. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge which is an empty claim must be given up. Education must be vocationalized throughout and students must be given opportunity to acquire the knowledge which they will require for their art. That art is broad but not vague. If it prepares them for it, all education becomes real and vocational, for the life of the religious person, of the citizen in a democracy, of the member of a family and a social and economic producer is the life unto which they are called.

I have a quarrel with the folks who are trying to give the good old word, vocation, the exclusive connotation of a money-earning occupation. One is called to many more things than to produce goods for sale. His education at all stages must, I think, be broader than a mere effort to acquire saleable skill, though at cer-

tain stages the development of saleable skill in a particular trade or occupation should be the chief element in his course, but not even then the only element.

We may take it for granted that the man who has not learned to do anything has not found and is not finding his place in society. He is not able to give himself a value in the social equation. His spirit must be that of the non-contributing member, of the outsider, the wanderer, the vagabond. You cannot make a society out of such men. Neither can you socialize them. To teach the young that each one of them has a place and a work to do, and that his main business in youth is to find out what that work is and to fit himself most diligently to do it, seems to me to be the whole purpose of education. Unless every part of it is going to make a difference in our after lives we had better omit it. The food producing or life maintaining occupation is the core of our activity. It is only a part of our activity—but it is and should be the organizing part. An education built upon the vocational motive broadly enough construed to enable the young person to acquire the elements of his entire work in life would I think be far more truly cultural than the formal education to which we misapply that adjective.

And I am going to claim for it that it will develop a more genuine sense of religion too. After all, it is working with the resisting material of life that brings us face to face with the great fact of God's existence and of the human law of justice and the great need for faith and loving kindness. Religion is just choosing the kind of a universe that we are forced to insist that this must be. Books may help us to decide what kind of a universe we must think this is, but the lives that we live tell us far more about that than even the best of books do. The man whose life is one untroubled joy may read his Bible, but its words must seem like an ancient tale to him. If his will throughout has its own way, he will not come to a realizing sense that he is a child of higher powers. He will worship himself and be his own disciple. Phrase it as we will, it is chiefly this self worship that keeps men away from God. Whenever they are caught up in the struggle of mighty forces which will not obey them but which they must take note of and obey, they become humbled and dependent. It is adversity rather than prosperity that purges the mind. In times of great public calamity alone do men see the glory of the coming of the Lord, for then only do they become genuinely other minded, feeling their own helplessness and their complete dependence upon a power which is

not themselves. Why do we all choose justice then rather than life and the way of sacrifice rather than peace without effort? Because we feel it is the will of God.

Now the education which introduces us early to the realities with which men have struggled ever since the world began, is far more certain than the education which comes from books, to make us aware of ourselves and the forces with which we must reckon. He who reads a book about agriculture will learn something about the recurring seasons and may gather from it that they are a benevolent arrangement to enable men to live, but he who tills a field will know the recurring seasons as a fact which he must reckon with or starve. He who studies physics for the culture of his mind will learn something about the law of gravitation, but he who builds a wall or constructs a house will have a realizing sense of it. It is what we do that teaches us. It is easy to get on with one's fellows in the school, but in the shop team-work and the ignominy of shirking are realities. Our little undertakings if they be real, teach us the importance of the virtues. Our great undertakings in which we stand together facing defeat and death, teach us perhaps for the first time in our lives that all that we can do is of but slight avail, that unless right is on our side and God fight for us our struggle is in vain. It is purpose, laying hold of life in race-old human ways rather than indifferent and aimless seeings and hearings, that we must depend upon to make men really conscious of the facts and significance of religion and morals. For a purposeful wrestling with conditions has a sobering poignancy about it as superior to a mere verbal taking account of them, as first-hand evidence is superior to hearsay evidence. It is in sweeping rooms, in herding sheep, in plowing fields, in driving engines, in tending machines, in fighting battles that one must learn to be a child of God, or his religion will be as little a work-a-day affair as his Sunday clothes are.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION

HOW IS INSTRUCTION IN "RELIGIOUS EDUCATION" RELATED TO INSTRUCTION IN "GENERAL EDUCATION"?

GEORGE A. COE, LL.D.

Professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York

It goes without saying that both the processes and the aims of religious education intertwine with those of so-called secular education. The relation is more intimate than intertwining; they are branches of the same tree, they partake of the same sap. Every theological seminary that deals seriously with the specific problems of religious education, especially every seminary that would fit men and women for professional work in this field, must either extend its own instruction very widely, and at great cost, or else secure for its students the privileges of some university department of education. The future supervisors of religious education, the authors, the editors, and ultimately the teachers, must have at least as good a scientific, technical equipment for their duties as the corresponding members of the "secular" school system. To accept less than this as a standard toward which to work in the seminaries would be irreligious.

The road before us is long and hard. In fact, most of the route has not yet been as much as surveyed. All the greater is the reason for being as wise as possible in our first steps. In this spirit—the cautious, humble spirit of beginners—let us ask just what it is that we desire from the university departments of education.

We have had enough experience already to know that the training given by these departments to their own students does not fit them to be forthwith teachers of religion or supervisors of religious schools. This ought not to be surprising. Upon what theory of transfer of training could we expect that a professional school that makes no study of religion, or of the religious life of children, could prepare its students to teach religion or to criticize the teaching of it? I find no fault with anyone when I say that persons whose training is thus restricted have been found to be as liable to non-observation of important facts, as liable to form snap judgments, and as liable to one-sided policies as a sound theory of transfer would enable one to foretell.

A different question confronts us when we ask what our

students of religious education should get from the university department or school of education. It is not enough to say that we wish them to add to subject A, which we ourselves teach, subjects B and C, which somebody else teaches. Let us not at the outset of our journey into professional religious education stumble into any such crude assumption as to what constitutes a curriculum. It is one of the tragedies of our colleges that they are so largely peddlers of subjects instead of being educators of men and of women. Even professional education has not escaped this evil. In the departments of education themselves one beholds the same departmentalizing of knowledge, the same mechanical juxtaposition of "subjects" in students' programs. Now, if this be the case with students to whom the faculty of education primarily addresses itself, we are not likely to find that the problem of relating our students to the instruction in "general education" has been solved for us in advance. We shall surely meet the question of how to make this and that "subject" into an organ of their life purpose.

There is one point at which one might suppose that this difficulty could not arise. Is it not possible, it may be said, to transfer bodily into religious education the ripe teaching of the universities as to methods of moral instruction and training? That a primary duty of the schools is to develop social attitudes, that is to say, moral character, is an everyday assertion of current educational theory. But in technical works on education what does "the learning process" mean? Does it refer to learning to adjust oneself from the heart to social standards? Does it refer to the process whereby one exchanges a lower moral purpose for a higher one? And in the present tidal wave of educational tests, where are the tests of the moral progress of pupils? Let us go a step farther. Granted that a spirit of moral earnestness pervades the departments of education, by what tests do these departments ascertain the type or level of the social-ethical notions of its students? As to developing moral living in children, our prospective educators certainly receive warnings as to what not to do, but how many of them depart from the university with any positive plan or program, any specific standards of a child's moral progress, or any notion of tests?

The simple truth is that the main body of educational science and practice still refers to teaching certain subjects; we have yet to acquire firm scientific control of the processes of moral growth. Our students of religious education can profit, it is true, from the warnings that issue from every university department of education

against repressive discipline, and against the substitution of formal instruction in duties for moral experience and the training of the moral will. We can use directly what these departments teach as to the social organization of school life. But as yet it cannot be said that they have any positive plan, system, standards, or tests for moral growth that they could hand over to us for our use. We ourselves shall have to wrestle directly with the problem of how to lead children on from the instinctive rudiments of sociality to social purposes that are at once intelligent, progressive, and warm-hearted.

From the university departments of education our students can learn much, very much, concerning methods of instruction, and concerning the supervision of teachers. Getting the theological student down to such details is most important, and for more reasons than one. He comes to us with the young college graduate's naive faith in the all-sufficiency of correct general notions, with a conception of the ministry that identifies its work with preaching, and with the young person's illusion that the real world is made up of adults. Nothing is more wholesome for him than to witness the actual teaching of children, to take part in it if possible, and to be set at the serious and intricate task of making a scientific analysis of what he has beheld. It is then that he learns how immature one can be in educational matters even after the theory of education has been intelligently mastered.

But it does not follow that the student should transfer into religious education precisely the methods of teaching or the standards of criticism that he finds in the university department of education. To the extent that "general education" erects the social-ethical purpose of education into a scientific control of the teaching process—to this extent, but not further, its methods and standards of criticism may be transferred without being re-worked. For the most part, re-working is necessary. Re-working, not rejection, not dilution, not lowering of standards. We cannot be content, for example, to teach history less thoroughly than the public schools. Yet the acquisition of facts must ever be with us a phase of the enlargement and progress of a moral will. This vital purpose should be present in all religious teaching. We should altogether reject the mechanical departmentalizing of the curriculum that merely piles a bale of one sort of knowledge upon a box of another sort. This vitalizing of teaching is difficult, to be sure. We shall have to resist a tendency to substitute religiosity for command of method. But just this is the sort of re-working that we shall have

to do after we have taken full advantage of all that the university department of education is now ready to offer us.

Instead of going further into the nature of this re-working in respect to various subjects of instruction, I desire to raise a broad question as to the significance of the term "general education." We inherit this term, I suppose, from the old, aristocratic, leisure-class theory of education that separates sharply between training for doing the world's work, and preparation for the life of a gentleman, a gentleman being one who possesses a generic human superiority, though he may have no superior skill or efficiency in anything in particular. With the decay of this ideal, the term "general," as applied to the study of education, tends to acquire another meaning, namely, the broad principles that determine the aims of education, and the natural laws that condition the process. Three subjects of study are in particular recognized as having this kind of generality: (1) The philosophy of education, which enlarges and clarifies the student's perspective, to the end that he may achieve an adequate purpose as educator. (2) The history of education, which helps the future educator, through analysis of accumulated experience, to define his own standards. (3) The psychology of education, which determines the conditions that favor or hinder the particular changes that the educator desires to effect in pupils.

That the religious educator has need of all these subjects requires no argument. There is, however, no compelling reason why all other branches of educational study should be regarded as merely accessory to these three. The sociology of education, for example, which reveals the relations of types and processes of education to social types, conditions, and changes, is obviously fundamental. So is educational administration. For not only is administration as vital in actual teaching as air, sunlight, and subject-matter (all of which, as a matter of fact, it determines), but it is never a mere application of something else; rather, it rests directly and originally upon mental and social laws.

If anyone should insist upon pursuing to the end the notion of "general" subjects that are "fundamental" as contrasted with others that are specific and accessory, he would find himself involved in the ancient logical problem of the relation between the universal and the particular, and he would discover that the medieval doctrine of *universalia ante rem*, though it has a name to be dead, still lives among us. It survives in the separation of the study of theory from the study of practice; it survives in the as-

sumption that the more general is *ipso facto* the more fundamental; it survives in the ranking of certain knowledge as fundamental, and other knowledge that is equally necessary for getting the job of education well done as accessory; it survives in the organization of the curriculum on the basis of "departments of knowledge" instead of the social functions that await the student.

The significance of this remark for our present topic is this: That religious education is not, and cannot be, a mere application of any generalities in which the university departments of education deal; it is not a mere "particular" that gets its meaning or finds its test in the "general." Least of all can religious education bear this relation to concepts, supposed to be general, that have been formed without any analysis of religious life. Religious education deals with original data, and with specific problems, that rarely appear, in the instruction that is called "general."

The fact that various phases of our enterprise can be classified as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and administration—that is, can be related thus to the ordinary subjects in a university department of education—does not of itself indicate very much. Classifications are tools; there is nothing more sacred about them than the assistance that they actually render us. They are as plastic as we take the trouble to have them. We can, for example, put under the head of history anything that we like out of the past or out of the present, and we can leave out anything that would be inconvenient in this place. The whole of educational psychology could be included within history, as far as logical relations are concerned, just as all the past and all the present of education could be put under the head of psychology or of sociology. In short, the purpose that we have before us when we deal with a fact is what determines its proper classification.

The religious purpose in religious education yields the point of view and the principle of classification that are important for us. For this reason we cannot say in advance, nor can anyone else, how often we shall find history of education, or educational psychology, or educational sociology, or the philosophy of education, or the principles and methods of educational administration worked out in such a way that we can use them to advantage. We cannot reasonably demand, at present, that these departments of instruction should be sufficiently broad to compass our interests, our data, or our problems. On the other hand, the scientific as well as practical fruitfulness of our vineyard can hardly be measured by the barrels in which our neighbors pack their apples.

The sum of the matter is this: (1) We have a set of new problems scientific and practical, that grow out of the specific nature of our educational purpose. (2) We have our attention upon fresh educational data, those of religious growth, and those of religious work with the young. (3) In the analysis of these data, and in the determination of methods, we can and must use material that is already contained in the "general" courses in the university departments of education. (4) But our own field of study is not only not exhausted therein, but is at once so specific and yet so broad as properly to constitute a recognized branch of educational science and of educational practice.

SEMINARY WORK IN EDUCATION

WHAT TRAINING IN EDUCATION SHOULD BE REQUIRED OF ALL SEMINARY GRADUATES?

WILLIAM J. DAVIDSON, PH.D.

Professor of Religious Education, Garrett Biblical Institute

The educational ideals of to-day make it imperative that the theological seminary along with other modern schools should be able to give a good educational reason for every course offered its students, and that every course should be given with a specific educational purpose.

It would seem then that all courses which the seminary requires should be required on the basis of nothing short of the *best* educational reasons. Granting that the required seminary courses meet the approval of the faculty, the reasons for requiring them should be cogent enough to convince the students of their educational value. The theological student is, on the average, mature enough to make it seem wise to take some note of his judgment as to the relative value of the various branches of the theological curriculum. He may not know much about curriculum-values, but the curriculum of a modern school is no longer organized for the sake of a curriculum; it is organized for the sake of the student and his efficiency in the task which awaits him. The required theological courses ought therefore to appeal to him as productive, not only in prospect but also in retrospect. Twenty years hence he should be able to justify himself in having taken such courses on the basis of their productivity in his ministry.

That theological curriculum would seem to be organized and administered best which makes it possible for the average student to enjoy, in the election of his courses, the maximum measure of freedom consonant with that essential breadth of theological education required of all who may be regarded as well trained for their life-work. Such freedom is especially desirable in that it tends to supply one of the essential conditions of the true motivation of study. Motivation of study which is from without is largely superposed and should be reduced to a minimum. It is liable also to be mechanical and artificial. In this period of his special training, in these potential years of his post-college work, the student has a right to be surrounded by conditions conducive to the largest possible measure of free motivation of his work, i. e., motivation which takes its rise from within, even though it be conditioned by certain special aspects of his life-work. It is this kind of motivation alone which tends to make the student's work free and joyous, and possesses the highest educational value for the student.

In the light of this principle, it may be asked whether there is any training in education which should be required of *all* seminary graduates. Doubtless some would question the educational wisdom of requiring all seminary graduates to take any one course of study or of training. It is quite probable that a small minority of students in the seminary take certain courses for no other reason than that they are required, and some of them are good students and men of high promise. Whatever the student's attitude towards a required course may be, the fact that it is required of all leaves him no option and eliminates whatever aid to free motivation might accrue from his own selection of this course or another on the basis of interest or specific purpose or professional value.

Whatever the opinion of theological students may be as to the relative educational values of free electives and prescribed courses of study and training, one may infer from a glance at the required courses in the curricula of nearly all the leading theological seminaries of America, representing all the larger denominations, that for many years to come certain theological courses will continue to be required. That being true, it would seem to make for the educational value of the theological student's work to organize the seminary curriculum into a group elective system wherein provision may be made for acquiring, during the first year, a rather wide theological outlook by means of studies in the less advanced sub-

jects, and at the same time, for insuring progress in specialization through the study of a group of carefully correlated subjects. One of these groups would be religious education including courses of training in education. By specializing in this group the student would prepare himself for the work of a director of religious education or for pastoral leadership in religious education. Here also he might earn an advanced degree.

Judged by their catalogues many of the theological seminaries of the United States give but scant attention to religious education as such. Upon what grounds may a seminary justify itself in failing to consider, or in deciding against, giving distinctive courses in religious education? Upon what grounds may a seminary offer courses, both required and elective, in religious education and in training in education? Let us see clearly that the theological seminary is not an end in itself. It can hardly escape, if it would, the obligation to consult the needs of the field which its graduates are to serve. It is especially true that so far as the curriculum of the seminary embraces training in education and a study of religious educational subjects, it must shape that part of its curriculum to meet certain demands which root themselves down into the real needs of the field. The commanding fact is that the church everywhere needs education in religion. The majority of seminary graduates become pastors of churches. And we are expected to determine the training in education which the pastorate itself requires of all seminary graduates who enter its ranks.

It would seem reasonable then to infer that the special character of the educational work which the modern pastorate includes should determine the special character of the preparation in education which the seminary should require of all those students especially who expect to become pastors or educational directors. What aspects of the modern pastor's work now are, and must continue to be, educational?

All other aspects of the pastor's educational activities aside for the moment, it has to be said that the work of preaching itself tends to reach its highest point of effectiveness, other things being equal, in direct ratio to the preacher's skill as a teacher. The need of a pulpit which can teach without loss of forcefulness and fervor is very great. There are preachers who teach, but whose lifting power appears to reach only a select few. On the other hand, there are many preachers whose pulpit work is forceful and abounding in enthusiasm, but almost barren of any direct educational influence. The work of the pulpit alone is an art which solicits every

accession of skill, in the putting of vital truth, that training in education can supply.

The modern pastorate teems with a multitude of interests of its own. In addition to the educative work demanded in the pulpit, the pastor has a church school to look after and usually several other organizations, the efficiency of which would be tremendously enhanced by the introduction of educational methods. Few church officers have been trained for their duties; some do not care for training, but many would welcome it if it were properly brought before them. There is no place quite so favorable for their training as the field in which they are expected to perform the duties of their respective offices. In the majority of cases, therefore, their trainer will belong to the field and be a co-worker with them. He cannot well be any other than the pastor himself, except in those churches which are strong enough to employ an educational director or assistant.

The outstanding work in education to which his parish expects him to give skillful supervision, at least, is that of his church school. The efficiency of its work may be conditioned by several community factors, among which are the home-life, the public schools, the street and its activities, the amusements, the recreational activities, the games, the sports, the character of the civic life, the industries, and the moral tone of the newspapers of the community. Moreover, the kind of organization the school has, the grading of its curriculum, teaching and teachers, the training its teachers have had and are receiving, the various activities of the school by departments, by grades and by individuals, its music, its forms of worship, its religious spirit, its building and equipment, its methods of extending its educational influence into the community and world as a whole, the active interest of the whole church in its work and welfare—all these and other factors have to do with its efficiency. Imagine a church whose educational work is well developed having to endure a pastor untrained in the technique of religious education. The educational work of the modern church, developed or undeveloped, demands pastoral leadership which has been given the best possible training in education.

First, what ought the pastor to *know* in preparation for the task in education to which the modern church challenges him? If he is to sustain educational relations to human nature he should know human nature. He positively cannot handle people as he handles books and other things. His work requires that he shall have skill in his reading of, and approach to, human nature. He is

compelled to work with human nature, not above it or away from it. Among the means whereby some helpful knowledge of human nature may be gained and the best methods of helping people educationally may be made somewhat more clear, is the study of psychology in its various branches. Somewhere, either in college or in the seminary, he should have had a thorough course in general psychology accompanied by as much experimental and applied psychology as possible. The social aspects of his pastoral relations, the relations of his church to the community, and his evaluation of the behavior of individuals under the influence of the forces which are let loose in crowds, would seem to require a fair knowledge of social psychology as well as sociology. The abnormal condition of certain members of the social group with which he must deal on rather intimate terms is of such a character usually as to give to a knowledge of abnormal psychology the value of an asset. Every individual with whom he deals has a biological, social, racial history, a history which one must know how to interpret as a prerequisite to the best work with him; hence it is probable that ignorance of genetic psychology would be a rather serious handicap to the pastor. There is so much teaching which the pastor must do that a knowledge of educational psychology is in daily demand in his field.

Religious education cannot be understood out of relation to the educative process in general, and the educative process as we know it and endeavor to promote it is not a sudden growth or entirely new departure. It has been developed in history. The principles of education approved and utilized to-day are the outgrowth of generations of educational experience. He best understands these principles and knows best their limitations and value as servants of the modern educator, who has made a careful study of their historical development. Furthermore, the evolution of educational ideals and practice has ever been vitally related to the development of the thought movements of the world, those very movements with which every well educated minister has long been supposed to be familiar. The interpretation of truth to any age and the spiritual stimulation of its life are always conditioned by the main currents of the philosophic thought of that age and equally perhaps by the precise forms of educational activity and the methods in education then in vogue. For these reasons the theological seminary should see to it that the men whom it is sending out into the pastorate have an elementary knowledge at least of introduction to philosophy and of the history and principles of

education as basal to their training in religious education. A course in the history of education may justly be regarded as necessary for the modern minister as is a course in the history of doctrine or in the history of the canon of Scripture. The principles of religious education, whatever may be the form they take in a given generation, are derived from the principles of education which specialists regard as fundamental to the development of education. If a teachers' college would not think of sending forth its graduates as bachelors in education without a knowledge of the history and principles of education, can a theological seminary longer afford to send forth its graduates to be educators in religion without requiring them to be grounded in the history and principles of the science which they are supposed to practice?

Ministers are educators in religion. What kind of educators? Do they know religious phenomena and the best methods of classifying, interpreting, and utilizing the same? Have they prepared themselves for this part of their task by means of a study of the literature of religious experience, by means of extended observations related to their special study, by introspection, and by the aid of all that specialists in the psychology of religion can contribute? The task of an educator in religion is one than which there is none in the world more delicate or difficult. No instrument which may aid him in the perfecting of his art may be neglected. Where there are a score of approaches to his educational task in a given parish, ill prepared and pitifully limited is the man who has learned but one approach. One value of a study of the psychology of religion lies in the fact that it tends to multiply the pastor's approaches to his educational task in religion, and the seminary cannot well overlook this item in his preparation.

In the next place, there are things which the seminary should require all future pastors *to do*. Lectures and text-books may be essential to fruitful training and, as such, an integral part of training, but provision must be made for *training* in religious education under supervision approved by the seminary. There are aspects of one's preparation for the educative work of the pastorate which become highly effective only as they are wrought out in the laboratory. Every seminary ought to give several courses in religious education, and in connection with every seminary where such courses are given there should be a school corresponding to the modern model or practice school where the student's laboratory work may be done. In such a laboratory the student is trained in all the technique of the religious education which he will be ex-

pected to develop and supervise in the pastorate. Here he endeavors to make real the ideals of the lecture room; here he tests for himself the values of the theories and principles which he may have gained some knowledge of, through books and lectures. Here he is required to do some constructive work in religious education on his own account; here, under criticism, his weakness as a teacher is revealed unto himself and his strength developed in contact with the very processes which later he will have to employ again and again.

He should be required to take courses in training in education which will familiarize him with the child and his religious possibilities and with the best methods of developing the normal character and personality of the child, by means of the processes of religious nurture. In the laboratory of this school he gets first hand knowledge of such matters as: worship adapted to the unfolding life of the individual, methods and materials of religious education appropriate to each succeeding stage of the child's development, methods of making tests not only of the progress of the child but also of the efficiency of the teaching, practice in organization, in grading, in curriculum building, in teaching in one department after another, in administration, in departmental work and supervision, in organizing the social and recreational activities which should accompany the work of each grade of the church school, and in special methods of religious education appropriate to the different periods of development of the individual, e. g., early, middle and later adolescence.

We learn by doing, but doing without discrimination and without supervision may result in experience which is worthless and habits which are harmful. Training in education, whether much or little, should be done therefore under critical supervision. The best normal schools have long known this. Training for work in religious education can be no exception in this respect. Every course of training in education required by the seminary should be provided with facilities for critical supervision and should also be closely correlated with the lectures and special studies in education. It would seem that the training and study outlined for the student who expects to become a pastor could occupy not less than three or four hours a week for one year; and this assumes that all work in psychology and in the history and principles of education will have been done in college, thus leaving the seminary free to give its attention to studies and training in religious education. Where approved training courses in education have been taken prior to

the seminary years, it would be possible to reduce the period of this special training in the seminary; but the amount of training now needed may render it necessary to extend the seminary course to four years, which would probably be a wise thing to do.

Speaking of the training of teachers, the President of the George Peabody College for Teachers recently said: "A profession cannot be a profession unless it is built upon these four elements: (1) a general education such as any educated man ought to have; (2) a special knowledge of his own subject; (3) a special body of professional subject-matter; (4) a special technique or method of procedure." These criteria apply to the training required for the profession of educational director in a church; and they apply, though perhaps in less degree, to the seminary training required of the man who is to become a pastor and, in that capacity, a general supervisor of the educational work which his church undertakes in religion.

Nothing has been said about the pastor's educational outreach into the community and the many educational activities of the community in which it is often expected that the pastor will participate. Let his educational work in his parish be of high order, and the community will insistently call him to co-operate with it in educational endeavors of wider scope than those of his parish. In most communities public school men are glad to co-operate with the pastor who is an intelligent, trained and willing worker in education. The work of the community in education for which, together with that of all other communities in the United States, we are paying upwards of one billion dollars annually, needs the co-operative activity precisely which the trained man in religious education can contribute. Education is of the very essence of American life. No parish can afford to ignore the educational influences which continuously surge about it, and over it, and through it. They are wonderful stimuli to the development of the community. The church which fails to respond to legitimate educational stimuli cannot live. Effective response is not accidental; it is the result of education. Is the church of to-day adequately educated? Is it a laggard in education as compared with the schools of the land? To whom must the church look for leadership in education in religion, which is the particular kind of education for which the world holds it responsible? It must look to a ministry trained in matters educational; it must look to the seminary.

The conclusion of the whole matter, therefore, is that the

seminary established for the training of ministers for contemporary life must require of its graduates that training in education which will enable them effectively to co-operate with the educational leaders of the world in the task of developing a generation that shall lift mankind up to a higher level of efficient living and into a truer and larger practice of genuine Christianity.

This would seem to make it incumbent upon the seminary to require of its graduates:

First, a knowledge of the elements of sociology, of the various branches of psychology, and of introduction to philosophy, or history philosophy, as a pre-requisite to studies and training in education;

Second, a knowledge of the history of education, and principles of education as fundamental to a study of the principles of religious education, and to training in education;

Third, definite course of training in a school of education or of religion as a laboratory in which the student must deal concretely with the various factors of education, familiarity with which his future field of service will require; and

Fourth, not less than one full seminary year of courses meeting at least three times a week in the study and practice of religious education.

BIBLE STUDY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES*

At a meeting of The Religious Education Association held in Chicago last year, this committee presented a tentative report. The results of a year's work had been of such a character that the committee were unwilling, at that time, to hand in anything which would speak with finality. The added year's work has only served to increase the feeling which the committee had of the unsatisfactory conditions of Bible study in most of the secondary schools. No two schools, the length and breadth of the land, seem to be doing similar work. The schools, in a vague sort of way, appreciate that Bible study is a good thing, but, as there has been no pressure brought to bear, no definite end to be achieved, the work might be said to be at sixes and sevens. The committee has in-

*Final Report of the Committee on the Relation of Bible Study in Secondary Schools and Colleges. Committee: Professor George Dahl of Yale University; Rev. F. J. Libby of Exeter; Rev. Raymond O. Knox of Columbia University; Rev. John T. Dallas of the Taft School.

vestigated with some care the courses offered by many of the leading preparatory schools and, also, the work done in the public schools of the United States and Canada. The work undertaken by Mr. Libby of Exeter to get information from the preparatory schools was of a thorough and painstaking character; 62 schools were written to. About half of them replied to Mr. Libby's request for information.

a. Only fifteen of these schools have curriculum Bible study. The remainder had none at all, or so little as to be hardly worth mentioning.

b. Many of the replies to Mr. Libby showed an interest, but also, an expression of helplessness in view of the fact that there had been no standardization of Bible study such as there has been in mathematics or in study of languages.

c. Among the schools which had carefully planned courses were Lawrenceville, The Hill School and William Penn Charter School.

d. None of the schools reported what the committee feels might be a well rounded course of study. The committee would suggest the following as a possible standard for preparatory schools.

1. To give such a knowledge of the Bible as will be a basis for further study.
2. The course should cover enough time to meet the requirements of the College Board, provided the Board should give us credit for one unit of work, that is, five hours per week for a year. The contents of such a course should include biographies: the Life and Teachings of Christ; the Life of Paul and the beginnings of the Christian Church; the memorizing of important sections, such as a list of all the books of the Old and New Testaments in order, ten or twelve great Psalms, the Ten Commandments, The Sermon on the Mount, First Corinthians 13, and several passages of dramatic interest: added to this should be map drawing which will be necessary to the intelligent study of the different periods in the Bible, and care should be taken that these courses be in accord with the development and interest of the youth. The earlier stages of the work should emphasize the memorizing of Bible passages. The later work should emphasize the study of biography.

Here followed in the Committee's Report, a summary of the eight different plans for the correlation of Bible study by high-school students to their regular school work. These plans have been described in detail in *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* in 1916, and the present status of this experiment is given in a paper, by Clarence A. Wood, to be published shortly in this magazine.

Although it is not hard to see the present confusion as to Bible study in secondary schools, it is encouraging to appreciate that there is so much of it and that, constantly, school masters, clergymen and Y. M. C. A. secretaries are having conferences and are feeling their way toward a better development of this side of education. This committee's interest is in curriculum Bible study, not devotional or voluntary Bible study. Our interest is the work which may lead up to Bible study in college. At the same time, we believe that the work in our secondary schools should take into consideration the fact that a great many of the students do not go to college. Therefore, it is recommended that the secondary school courses should be complete in themselves and not merely preliminary for college work.

At the last meeting of the committee, the conclusion was reached that the only way in which Bible study in secondary schools could be standardized was by the colleges. If the colleges will give credit such as they do in other branches, there will be more purpose than there is at present in advocating that boys and girls take up this study. At the recent meeting of the Association of Biblical Instruction, held in New York City, this same conclusion was reached and warmly advocated by most of the members present. This committee was gratified to find that their conclusions had been reached by other people who were thinking on the same subject. We would recommend heartily that a movement be put on foot to secure from the colleges a statement of their willingness to accept Bible study as an entrance subject. In reply to a letter from this committee, a member of the Board of Examiners brought to our attention the fact that they will offer an examination in Bible when the colleges ask for it. They have no authority to go ahead in this matter. They present examinations only in such subjects as the colleges demand. In view of this fact, we would suggest that the Religious Education Association join hands with the Association of Biblical Instruction in American Colleges in urging the colleges to adopt this recommendation. It is also hoped that the Religious Education Association will recommend to the seminaries the need of training men as Bible teachers. In view of the fact that in some

localities the Bible work of the public schools is being done in the churches, it is the belief of the committee that, after the colleges have set a standard in Bible study, there will be a reaction felt not only in preparatory schools and high schools, but in the Sunday schools throughout the country. If we can get the colleges to do this, we shall have accomplished a splendid piece of work which will reach to the very corners of our land.

STANDARDIZATION OF BIBLICAL DEPARTMENTS IN COLLEGES*

Last year when this committee made its report 114 representative colleges and universities of the country had been examined as to the work offered in Bible study and the equipment provided for such work. This was only a start. During the year just closing much more has been accomplished. The list of institutions investigated has crept up to 238. Moreover colleges and educators are beginning to take notice that the Bible teachers' section of the Religious Education Association is in earnest in uncovering the facts concerning what is being offered in this subject. It has been very interesting to observe the attitude towards this question of better standards for Bible teaching that has been taken by the various presidents, professors, deans and registrars with whom correspondence has been established. It has also thrown much light upon the present status of Biblical instruction in America. One cannot be altogether proud of it when he discovers that out of these 238 institutions, that represent practically the best we have in the country, only 64 can qualify for the A class or less than one-fourth, and that the majority are in the C, D, and E classes. And this is true notwithstanding the fact that the tests we have adopted are very modest in character, surely by no means magnifying the position any department should take in measuring up to collegiate standards.

There has been, however, much encouragement, as will be seen as our report proceeds. The fact that the best Bible teachers in the country are as a rule taking a cordial interest and often an enthusiastic one towards the work we are trying to do is one helpful indication. The fact that many college presidents are also taking this attitude, and many others are setting to work immediately to

*The Report of the Committee on Standardization of College Biblical Departments; Laura H. Wild, Chairman; Charles F. Kent, Frank K. Sanders. The report for the preceding year will be found at p. 311 in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION for August, 1916.

remedy conditions, is also encouraging. The fact that there is a general dislike to being classified in any but the A group and many vigorous protests against the effort as a whole and against classifying a particular institution is another healthy sign, at least an indication of the importance of the work, which opposition usually betrays. There has been some very kindly criticism which it is well for us to take into consideration as we discuss the feasibility of proceeding with the work. But the most hopeful sign of all and the one that makes us believe the labor is worth while, is the fact that during the year there has been a decided improvement in the reports sent in by at least twelve of the institutions reporting at our last annual meeting. Four have come up from the B group to the A group, one from C to A, one from D to B, three from D to C and three from E to D. And we have had the testimony of more than one college teacher and president also that it has been of the greatest help to him in approaching trustees and administrators to have this organization behind him.

We still have much to contend with in attempting to place Biblical instruction on a par with other collegiate work. There is yet in some quarters, especially the South, a total misconception of the academic situation, an assumption that one hour a week of Bible farmed out to various instructors in other departments is quite sufficient. This came out in the meeting of the Association of American Colleges held in Chicago in January when various presidents arose to explain how adequate was the Biblical instruction offered in their institutions. Another difficult place in the woods we have to clear is the assumption by Y. M. and Y. W. C. A.'s that voluntary Bible study is really better on the whole than curriculum courses. Many college presidents have evidently been thankful to have the matter taken off their hands in this manner and disposed of without the necessity of appropriating funds to establish a chair of Biblical study. As to equipment it is not easy to make some institutions realize that any Sunday school maps they happen to have on hand and any theological books that swell the numbers in their library may not count in our standards. However, there has been a very gratifying response with regard to the sample list of 250 books authorized by the Association of Bible Teachers in Colleges and Schools at their meeting in New York last December. Several presidents have said they would see to it at once that the list was completed in their libraries.

One of the most frequent misunderstandings we have had to clear away has been the assumption that any subjects in any way

allied to Christian teaching should be counted in the number of hours offered by a Biblical Department; Ethics, Philosophy, Christian Evidences and Missions are most often inserted. It has finally been found necessary to define our position thus, that in answering the tests for the A class, twelve hours out of the eighteen should be upon the Bible itself; in this number Hebrew and New Testament Greek may count and the history of the East so far as it has to do with the Biblical background, namely Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian history for the Old Testament, and Greek and Roman history so far as they are related to New Testament times. The remaining six hours may be given to Religious Education as the term is now technically understood; but of course Ethics and Philosophy and Christian Evidences as a part of Philosophy belong to other departments. Comparative Religions, however, and Missions, if taught in the light of comparative religions, have a place here. The misunderstanding seems to arise for the most part in those institutions that have failed to grasp the significance of the new movement for religious education and the content of that term as now applied. Such institutions have also often failed to grasp clearly the limits of a modern Biblical department in the study of the Bible itself.

One of the criticisms received has been that the spiritual values of Biblical work are the most important of all and that in this effort to standardize the courses given, attention seems to be centered upon the outward and mechanical arrangement, the cold, scholastic ideals rather than the vital religious energy that should be imparted through such courses. One of our sane and highly esteemed presidents, himself formerly the head of a Biblical Department, has put it most kindly in the following paragraph: "You know, I am sure, that I am deeply in sympathy with the end that you seek to reach by this plan. But you will let me register a protest by a very prejudiced partisan in saying that I do not believe in standardization. It is universally appealed to in education, and as universally seems to me to miss the soul of things. I know that in substance you would agree with me, for I know the values that you seek. The trouble seems to me to be that an institution might be in Class A and yet might make practically no contribution to the intelligent output of living interest in the message of the Bible. This has led me to feel that the emphasis needed to be distinctly in other quarters. I especially feel this when it comes to dealing with the data and material of the spiritual life. I know you will pardon this expression of qualified enthusiasm."

Such criticisms are worth listening to and we would doubtless all agree that the goal we are trying to reach is a Biblical Department in each college so full of the spiritual dynamic and at the same time so scholarly that it will be a potent spiritualizing factor in the life of the students while appealing to the respect of their trained minds. But spiritual perception, spiritual interpretation and spiritual power belong to such a free and spontaneous part of the individual character that any attempt to confine it by stated demands at once drives it under cover. It is like genius, a free element, to be generated and fostered, but not to be harnessed to restrictions. Should we, therefore, give up all attempts to raise the scholarly standards of Bible teaching because it is impossible to include standards of spiritual power? This criticism is largely the ground for whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the respective values of voluntary and curriculum Bible study. American colleges seem, however, in general, to have arrived at the conclusion that Christian Association work is not all that is necessary even in the religious life of students, that while it is a most valuable adjunct, the college itself has a definite responsibility towards the Bible which it cannot put over upon the shoulders of any other organization, and that as a college it must fulfill that obligation in a collegiate and therefore scholarly manner. Is not this a worthy goal to be exerting ourselves to attain although in doing it we frankly acknowledge the impossibility of weighing perfectly the values attached to such study? It will doubtless always remain true that the college that can secure the personality of a spiritually-minded instructor, is, other things being equal, vastly ahead of any merely academically ideal institution. We can, as Bible teachers, register our emphatic belief in this principle while doing what we can to lift Biblical study above reproach from the standpoint of scholarship.

Another criticism that has come has been that we seem to discriminate against the president of a college being the head of the Biblical Department. In some small colleges it seems that the president is better equipped than anyone who could be obtained for the salary available and it seems necessary that the president do some teaching. But it has been explained that a first-class department of Chemistry or History would require that its head make that department his chief concern and certainly a president cannot make one department his chief concern nor give it even a major portion of his time.

But while these are some of the adverse criticisms, we would

like to quote from some of the encouraging letters. One institution writes, "I wish to express my gratification at this investigation, for I think it will be helpful in this institution." Another—"We have for the present only to O. K. your classification. We hope some day to establish a department which will cause you to rate us much higher." A state university president says, "We have nearly all the books and will at once obtain what is lacking." Another president writes, "While of course we are not proud of being classed in C, yet we are fully resolved to attain to Class A and shall feel indebted to the plan for standardization for pointing the way to better equipment. I would greatly appreciate receiving three more copies of the list of books for a college reference library. I am fully determined to have all these books in our library at the earliest date." A professor writes, "Since returning from the meeting at Columbia \$200 has been made available for books for this department." Another president says, "I fear we have not the 500 books (required for the A class.) However we hope before another year to have this classification."

The work of this committee the past year has elicited much more recognition and interest than the first year; a larger proportion of institutions have taken pains to answer the questionnaire, and have shown by their inquiries for further information a desire to be in intelligent touch with this movement. However, there are a good many who have not responded and have apparently ignored the matter as unimportant. It is to be hoped that another year a more complete report may be given than is possible at this time.

We will now proceed to a more detailed description of the results of the year's work and then propose certain questions that should be settled if the committee is to pursue the work any further.

The plan that has been followed in the investigation has been first to send out a questionnaire embodying inquiries that would show the status of an institution concerning Bible study and from which it could be classified according to the eight tests adopted last year. After such a classification had been made, a list of the tests for each of the five classes was sent the president of each institution asking that he verify the classification. At the same time a list of the 250 books approved by the Association of Bible Teachers was enclosed and the maps recommended specified, namely, either the Palestine Exploration Fund series, the Kent-Madsen series, or the George Adam Smith Atlas. In not a few cases serious discrepancies occurred between the answers to the first paper and the

second, the wisdom of sending the two papers being quite apparent. Where such discrepancies and misunderstandings have occurred an attempt has been made to clear them up so far as possible. The final result as now tabulated shows 64 in the A class, 30 in B, 74 in C, 44 in D, and 26 in E where no Bible work at all is offered. Of this total number, 11 are questionable as to their right classification because of incomplete reports. About 180 out of the 238 have verified their classification by signing the tests officially. Thirty-four state universities and normal schools have responded, 20 of these showing that some work in Bible is offered. Four have the fine record of being in the A class, namely, Michigan, Missouri, Texas, and Virginia, two are in the C class, and 14 have one or more courses offered in other departments, usually in the Department of English Literature. According to indications the Y. M. C. A. seems to be more vigorous in state institutions than elsewhere, thus making up in some measure the lack of curriculum Bible study.

Following are the names of institutions in the A group.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION—DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES; SECTION OF BIBLE TEACHERS

CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS FOR 1917

Class A

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Allegheny | Meadville, Pa. |
| Alma | Alma, Mich. |
| Baker University..... | Baldwin City, Kan. |
| Baldwin-Wallace | Berea, Ohio |
| Bates | Lewiston, Maine |
| Bethany | Bethany, W. Va. |
| Boston University..... | Boston, Mass. |
| Bridgewater | Bridgewater, Va. |
| Brown University..... | Providence, R. I. |
| Bryn Mawr | Bryn Mawr, Pa. |
| Bulter | Indianaoplis, Ind. |
| Carleton | Northfield, Minn. |
| Chicago, University of..... | Chicago, Ill. |
| Colgate University..... | Hamilton, N. Y. |
| Colorado | Colorado Springs, Colo. |
| Columbia University..... | New York, N. Y. |
| Davidson | Davidson, N. C. |
| Denver University..... | Denver, Colo. |
| De Pauw..... | Greencastle, Ind. |
| Drake | Des Moines, Iowa |
| Drury | Springfield, Mo. |
| Earlham | Richmond, Ind. |
| Fargo | Fargo, N. Dak. |
| Goucher | Baltimore, Md. |
| Grinnell | Grinnell, Iowa |
| Hamline | St. Paul, Minn. |
| Hanover | Hanover, Ind. |
| Harvard University..... | Cambridge, Mass. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Hastings | Hastings, Neb. |
| Haverford | Haverford, Pa. |
| Hillsdale | Hillsdale, Mich. |
| Hiram | Hiram, Ohio |
| Huron | Huron, S. Dak. |
| James Milliken University..... | Decatur, Ill. |
| Jamestown | Jamestown, N. Dak. |
| Juniata | Huntingdon, Pa. |
| Lake Erie | Painesville, Ohio |
| Lake Forest | Lake Forest, Ill. |
| Lawrence | Appleton, Wis. |
| Macalester | St. Paul, Minn. |
| Michigan, University of | Ann Arbor, Mich. |
| Mt. Holyoke | South Hadley, Mass. |
| Northwestern University | Evanston, Ill. |
| Oberlin | Oberlin, Ohio |
| Ohio Wesleyan University | Delaware, Ohio |
| Penn | Oskaloosa, Iowa |
| Piedmont | Demorest, Ga. |
| Pomona | Claremont, Colo. |
| Randolph-Macon (for men) | Ashland, Va. |
| Southern California University | Los Angeles, Cal. |
| Smith | Northampton, Mass. |
| Syracuse University | Syracuse, N. Y. |
| Tarkio | Tarkio, Mo. |
| Texas, University of | Austin, Texas |
| Trinity College | Durham, N. C. |
| Vassar | Poughkeepsie, N. Y. |
| Virginia, University of | Charlottesville, Va. |
| Wellesley | Wellesley, Mass. |
| Wells | Aurora, N. Y. |
| The Western College for Women | Oxford, Ohio |
| William Jewell | Liberty, Mo. |
| Wilmington | Wilmington, Ohio |
| Wooster | Wooster, Ohio |
| Yale University | New Haven, Conn. |

The following question has been raised. Shall colleges offering theological courses be admitted into the A class unless offering also strictly undergraduate collegiate courses? This is a very serious question especially in the Middle West, for some small denominational institutions doing rather inferior collegiate work have theological departments offering short cuts to ministers and at the same time throwing the courses open to undergraduates. But a course for theological students is not the kind of course adapted to undergraduates, neither is denominational theology what we mean by a study of the Bible. It is not fair to rank such an institution in the A class alongside of those that are looking out for their undergraduates in the sense of collegiate courses of high grade. It has finally seemed necessary for the committee to say that in our judgment eight hours must be given for undergraduates alone, allowing electives among theological courses to count beyond this number. But the eight hours should be offered within the college walls, not in the theological school. However in the case of two or

three universities where a Bible school close at hand is recognized and credits given by the university, the courses being advertised in the university undergraduate catalogue and certain ones required as fundamental, such courses have been allowed to count in the classification.

The committee would recommend that a corresponding member be appointed if possible in each state to check up the progress made by institutions within that territory and to investigate those not yet upon our list, this corresponding member to report to the central committee at least once a year. We would also recommend that the personnel of the central committee be changed from year to year by dropping one of the old members and electing one new member each year.

WORLD WIDE WORK IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THE ANNUAL REPORT

HENRY F. COPE, D.D.

General Secretary The Religious Education Association

The world has come into a new community life; it is not a community of common ideals or of common aims, but a community of sympathy welded through suffering into a realization of inescapable propinquity. We are in the era of world neighboring. To-day there are no foreigners nor any foreign lands.

In this new welding of the world, with all its terrible and unpardonable pain and loss, there are many elements of gain. We never more can set national barriers about our human sympathies. The tides of life have flowed across all barriers. They have swept our divisions away. Even hatred is likely to be forgotten now that the boundaries marked by tradition are gone. This process has not been due to the war alone; it has been going on for some time. The nerves of transportation and communication have been binding mankind into one body and making a unified person thereof. In this process the Religious Education Association has had its part; during the past five or six years our membership has extended from North America into practically every political division of the world. The organization has become truly international. Or, perhaps we may retire the phrase "international" and speak of the Religious Education Association as a World Association.

To-day the Association is not only the common organization of all faiths and of every type of educational instruction and endeavor, but it forms literally a world council in the common interest and cause of moral and religious training. There are members in every continent and every country; they are not only missionaries but they are also native educators, administrative officers and religious workers.

The organization of the Association is so simple that its relations are just as real to the member in Shanghai as to the member in Chicago, and in most particulars the service it can render to the one is just as direct as that to the other. The Bureau of Information receives inquiries and sends out material to every corner of the globe. Perhaps on no other subject than that of moral and religious training would it be possible to find such a universal and common ground of principles and usable methods for all the world. It seems to be worth while to realize that not only has this Association extended its membership and services over a world-wide field, but that its particular propaganda is one of the most simple and effective means of securing a unity of feeling, of purpose and activity, in the whole body of mankind everywhere.

In view of the discussions of this convention it hardly seems to be necessary to suggest that the Religious Education Association has a very direct service to render in the present world situation. Everywhere men are coming to realize that fundamentally the differences between the struggling peoples are not economic or political, but are social and therefore, moral and profoundly religious. They rise out of the points of view and interpretations of life to which people have been trained, toward which the youth has been educated. Further, we are coming to believe that any permanent settlement must in the end depend not upon legislation nor upon regulation by force or agreement, but upon the tremendous controlling power of the motives and ideals of people, that there can be no peace until peace and righteousness have met and have become enthroned in the affections of mankind. As so many writers in Great Britain recently have pointed out, the great need is a change in the minds and hearts of men, a change that will lead them to see such values and form such interpretations of life as will put social, personal ends first, and will substitute for the reign of force and things the reign of personal, spiritual worth. Now, this is peculiarly the problem of religious education; we seek to go to the root of this matter, to discover the principles, determine the ideals, elaborate the methods, and develop the practice by which

the educational agencies may grow persons as religious persons, into a religious society. The program of religious education has to do with the organization of motive, the training of will, the development of habit. Doubtless men will come to see in an increased degree how hopeless is any program of world organization that does not change and organize the springs of conduct and the motives and minds of persons.

Further, the Association now deliberately meets the world problem in an attempt to face this question: in view of the profound social changes now taking place—changes which are really constructing for us a new world—what may be done to train and prepare those who must live in the new world for its life? Formerly education looked back, conserving the values of the past, to-day it looks out and in the light of those values seeks to adjust lives to the present; but religious education can do vastly more; we must face forward and by the light of yesterdays and the experiences of to-day train for to-morrow. The youth with whom we have to do, not only live to-day but they are to live in the new world of the future. To what degree have our programs of education, and consciousness of coming social changes; our current religious training, prepared young people for a world different from our world and from that of our father's? Our old prudential morality has broken down, our individual piety has failed; they are insufficient to-day; they will have no meaning to a day in which the world is all one neighborhood. It will be impossible to live under that coming social order—in a day when we shall find a new intensive truth in the statement that "no man lives to himself"—by any Benjamin Franklin maxims or code of business ethics, or by any creed of individualism. It will be possible only as one can take life in terms of the lives of others, as one can see it as a chance to give life, to find life by losing it in service. In other words, the religious interpretation and method of life will be the only possible one; all others lead to continued conflict and social suicide. The only hope of existence for the youth of to-day in the life of to-morrow, lies in religious training.

In the present crisis then, religious education passes over from programs of organization, of curriculum, of teaching this or that, or organizing in this or the other form of instructional agency, to the tremendous task of meeting the world need, of pointing the only way in which the lives of the young adequately can be trained for the life of to-morrow.

Whatever discouragements or limitations this Association may

meet in its work, it is buoyed up by the consciousness of meeting the outstanding need of the present hour.

We look out on clashing armies and a political strife; it is not foreign to us nor is it viewed from cloistered academic calm. We look out on a world groaning in the travail of a new birth and toward this new life we make our contribution by earnest endeavor to grow personal lives for the new social order. All that the Association does in aiding and counselling churches, schools, parents, etc. it does as a very real part of the world's work of spiritual self-discovery.

The report for this year may be disappointing to those who find delight in statistics. The facts are presented in the annual financial statement and speak for themselves. It has seemed to the Secretary worth while to call attention to some of the outstanding and significant facts of the Association's work and fields, rather than to attempt any tabulation and analysis of the figures of work.

One of the outstanding facts this year has been the awakened consciousness as to the development, complication and duplication in this relatively new field. When we remember that the phrase, "religious education," was comparatively a new one when the Association was organized in 1903, it is not less than astonishing to contemplate the currency of the phrase to-day, and to note the number of organizations which have sprung up bearing this name and operating in this field. So far as I am aware, in 1903 only two organizations were working in this field; neither apparently was conscious of the phrase, "religious education," nor for that matter, of the significance of the phrase. Now, consider, first, the different organizations at present at work, all of which except the first two, have sprung up since the Religious Education Association was organized:

- The International Sunday School Association,
- The American Sunday School Union,
- The World's Sunday School Association,
- The Missionary Education Movement,
- The Interdenominational Council of Sunday Schools,
- The Reorganized Sunday School Lesson Committee,
- The Conference of University Pastors,
- American Association of Teachers of the Bible in Colleges and Universities,
- The Society for Biblical Research,
- The Pan-Hellenic Conference,
- The Council of Church Boards of Education,

The American Association of Church Colleges,
The Federal Council Commission on Christian Education,
Commission on Accredited High School Bible Study,
American Institute of Sacred Literature,
Board of Missionary Preparation,
The American Institute of Child Life,
The Moral Education Board,
The various commissions on religious education in the different church communions,
Numerous state and local organizations for promoting accredited Bible study.

To the list of organizations might properly be added the Council and the various departments of the "R. E. A." each having its own autonomy and conducting its own work. There are fifteen of these and several are conducting special investigations, carrying on experiments and preparing reports.

Next, one should add the several new activities in this field, such as

Community institutes of religious education,
Local guilds of religious education,
Religious education clubs at universities, etc.,
Pacific Coast division of the R. E. A.,
Canadian division of the R. E. A.,
Summer institutes of religious education,
Summer training schools of religious education,
Lectures at summer normal schools,
Reading courses in religious education,
College courses in religious education,
Departments and chairs on religious education in theological seminaries,
Courses in training schools,
Creation of the new profession of "directors of religious education,"
Educational buildings for churches,
Special libraries,
Departments in publication,
The Gary plan of week-day instruction,
The "Colorado," "Indiana" and other plans of accredited Bible study.

It would be impossible to state in detail all that has developed in this field, the changes in denominational machinery, the institution of new departments in papers and magazines, the establishment of

college and seminary courses and—in some degree a tribute and testimony—the tendency of the fakir and pretender to trade on the force of the phrase, "religious education."

But there is another side to this.

Out of the multitude of organizations arises the danger of duplication of effort. It is not uncommon to see one organization planning enterprises, programs and investigations that simply cover the ground already worked at an earlier date by another organization. Conferences are held and papers are read which are simply repetitions of other conferences and other papers. The multifarious activities may well be a matter of congratulation as compared to the absolute sterility of this field only a few years ago. But waste is never pardonable. Investment in mere duplication is economic and religious waste. We have a pressing duty to discover the reasonable bases of assignment of field and correlation of duties. One of the urgent problems of religious education is the conservation of our energies, their co-ordination and unified direction.

It seems as though the Religious Education Association has a perfectly clear function. It must continue to do what it has done from the beginning, to act as the common, inclusive, unifying, stimulating and investigating agency. Amongst all the different forces it must afford the open forum where all can come together, and to the general and fundamental problems of religious education it must direct the trained scientific service of educational leaders. It must offer the world a platform broad enough for all religious persons, sufficiently lifted above the fogs of controversies to afford a clear vision.

It must continue to furnish the machinery by which the best that is known or accomplished anywhere may be made available to all. It must stand ready to co-operate with any, and to aid all, in co-operating one with another.

Your Secretary calls the attention again of the Association to the serious need for adequate funds with which to prosecute new investigations and studies, and to maintain those that have already been started. Important work is now under way in several departments, the results of which are fundamental to any scientific work in religious education; but this work is most seriously hampered by the limited income of this organization.

We have two distinct features of work: One, by the spread of popular membership, to make current everywhere the newer ideals of religious education and to familiarize persons everywhere with

practicable methods; the other, to enlist and organize expert leaders in the study of outstanding problems by investigation and experimentation. A program of this kind does not readily attract financial support. It is much easier to get a million dollars for a building than it is to get one hundred dollars to determine the scientific principles upon which that building might be erected or made one hundred per cent more valuable. The Religious Education Association cannot make the spectacular type of appeal; it must first convert its givers to an understanding of its principles. We are, therefore, thrown back very largely on our own resources, on such income as may be secured by membership and by relatively small gifts.

What has been going on during the year in the office organization?

CONFERENCES. The Secretary has attended conferences and conventions and delivered addresses in the following states: Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin.

Many conferences have been conducted by officers of the Association in other places.

The most important meetings, beside the annual convention, were those of the Pacific Coast Division, held at Portland, Oregon. Here an unusually fine program made a distinct impression on the North Pacific coast by its catholic and scholarly character.

PUBLICATIONS. Besides the regular issues of the magazine *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*, the office has published seven official pamphlets and twelve pamphlet reprints, as follows:

The Child's Religious Nature,

A Bibliography on Relations of Public and Religious Education,

Religious Instruction and Public Education (seven papers),

The Week-day Plan in Gary,

The North Dakota Plan,

The Indiana High School Plan,

Credit for Bible Study,

A Bibliography on the Family,

The Church School Building,

Training Teachers of Religion,

Contemporary Religious Ideals,

A Library on Religious Education.

Besides these the office continues to distribute large numbers of pamphlets printed in previous years.

BUREAU OF INFORMATION. This important service, maintained throughout the year, has answered approximately 8,000 inquiries, distributed over 150,000 pamphlets of the Association, and approximately 30,000 from other sources. The inquiries have come from all parts of the world and upon almost every imaginable subject. The topics of week-day instruction and accredited Bible study occupy first place, then would come new courses in the study of religion, especially for adult and college classes, family training, building for church schools and books for libraries.

THE LIBRARY EXHIBIT has made a gain of over 500 volumes (without cost to the Association) and now has about 5,500 books and 7,000 pamphlets filed.

MEMBERSHIP CAMPAIGN. Special help has been employed for some months and vigorous efforts have been maintained all through the year to increase the membership. The results are seen in the report of new members, making a net gain of about three hundred. This may seem to be but a small gain, but the truth is that it is not easy to secure new members by correspondence from the office. Every invitation smacks of the formal and official. The one successful method is through the present membership. Each member can gain new members with less labor by far than can the office. The individual invitation of a member is worth ten times as much in effectiveness as any invitation from the office.

THE WORK OF DEPARTMENTS

The Council completed its study of plans of week-day instruction of school children in religion, the principal results have been published in five pamphlets and over seventy thousand copies have been distributed. For some months past the Council has been preparing a statement of an "educational creed," a presentation of the fundamental principles of religious education in view of world conditions and needs. This will be formulated and offered at this convention. The Council is also planning a program for a summer session on some special problems in religious education.

The section of Bible Teachers in Colleges continues its investigations into college departments of the Bible and Religion, and is preparing a report for publication. This is valuable work, as it helps to establish standards as to equipment and teaching staff. It should be understood that all attempts at standardization in the Religious Education Association are of an informal character; the

Association does not attempt to speak in any official capacity as to the character of academic work, but rather to gather and make available certain categories of facts.

The Department of Church Schools has had several commissions at work, which render their reports at this convention. Some of these have conducted studies spreading over several years. They have made valuable contributions. Others are still under way, one of the most important, on "The Child's Religious Nature," will take a long time in which to gather up any useful body of data.

A study of training schools is being planned under the direction of the Council, co-operating with the departments of Christian Associations and Training Schools.

For the first time in eleven years this convention holds two sessions of "Private Schools." It is hoped than an active department may be organized in this very large and important field.

Nearly all the work carried on by different departments, often at a rather considerable expense, is done without cost to the Association; only the more elaborate investigations become an expense to its treasury. The officers of the departments have cheerfully carried the labor and charges of the rest of this work.

And now, as we meet in Boston again, after an interval of twelve years, it is interesting to compare the conditions at that time with those of to-day. Then the Association came before the public with a novel message; it was a new organization with new life blood. To-day the novelty is less but the vitality and strength greater. Then the Association had an actual membership of about eleven hundred, saddled with a very heavy debt. To-day we have 3,300 members, and the debt has been wiped out. This statement, however, does not at all cover the really important points of contrast. To do so would be to tell of the work accomplished through the departments, of the increased efficiency in the organization, of the new fields developed, new forms of work initiated, enterprises supported; to tell of the devotion of the officers and members maintained all through these years, of the long, sacrificing service of many who were at the first Boston meeting and who have given some of the best of their lives to this cause. That is to touch the secret of any success achieved, any progress made and any contribution which the Association has offered to the good of mankind.

A CITY BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

FIFTEEN YEARS OF THE PROVIDENCE BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

HENRY G. FOWLER, PH.D.

Professor, Brown University

The Providence Biblical Institute, now completing its fifteenth year of active service, affords an interesting example of co-operation between church and college. The Institute arose from a union of forces of the Department of Biblical Literature of Brown University and a number of leading clergymen and laymen of Providence. Through this union, the Biblical lectures, which the department had previously arranged for the public, were absorbed in a larger undertaking that contemplated several courses of lectures each year and the conduct of study classes as well.

In its inception, the purpose of the Institute was formulated as: "To foster a more widespread interest in the study of the Bible, particularly in its literary and historical aspects." The work of the organization has always centered about this object, although lectures upon other subjects of religious interest have occasionally been introduced. This year, for example, the Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches has given a course on "The Church and the Social Order." In past years, Dean Hodges has given vivifying courses upon the early history of the Church, while Professor E. C. Moore of Harvard has presented themes of living interest in the history of nineteenth century religious thinking and social changes, and the late Professor George W. Knox of Union Seminary broadened and deepened the religious sympathies of the members with a notable course upon "The Spirit of the Orient."

In the main, however, the purpose as originally stated has been closely followed. Courses of lectures by Professors Nash and Fosbrooke of Cambridge, G. F. Moore of Harvard, Platner of Andover, Bacon and Kent of Yale, Genung of Amherst, Mitchell of Boston, Paton of Hartford, Rogers of Drew, and Anderson of Newton; Presidents Horr of Newton, and Fitch of Andover; Drs. J. P. Peters, F. K. Sanders, R. M. Hodge, and Mrs. Houghton of New York; Rev. Stuart Tyson of Princeton and Rev. Robinson Lees of London, have dealt with distinctively Biblical subjects. Since each of the speakers has given, not single lectures, but one or several courses of lectures, the considerable number who have been members of the Institute from its beginning have had opportunity to learn the general point of view of a group of Biblical scholars and

interpreters such as no theological seminary or university assembles upon its faculty in any one generation. In addition, the organization has offered to the public single lectures by such speakers as Drs. Hamilton W. Mabie, Richard G. Moulton, Charles G. Trumbull, Hugh Black, President Francis Brown, Sir William M. Ramsay, and Bishop Brent.

Several widely useful books, notably Bacon's "Story of St. Paul," Genung's "Hebrew Literature of Wisdom," and Nash's "The Atoning Life," have carried to a larger audience material first brought together in lecture courses of the Providence Institute. All the courses have been adapted to an audience made up largely of the laity, but they have not been brought down to the intellectual level of lectures commonly styled "popular."

During the greater part of its history the organization has also conducted "study classes" designed especially for the training of Sunday school teachers. Sometimes these have been carried on independently, sometimes in co-operation with the Rhode Island Sunday School Association or other organizations, the aim always being to supplement and serve in whatever way would best and most economically meet the needs of Providence and neighboring communities.

In the maintenance of the work, the receipts from the membership dues, together with a small amount from single admission and course tickets sold to non-members, have nearly always met the expenses of the lectures. The Institute never invites any one to lecture for his expenses alone, but always proposes a honorarium in addition to liberal expenses. The honorarium is not so large as the distinction of the lecturers might suggest, but it is as great as the income makes possible. The university provides without rent or incidental charges the use of one of its lecture halls, and in return the Professor of Biblical Literature, who is also Secretary of the Institute, is allowed to admit university students to the lectures upon such terms as he deems best. At times one of the Institutes series of lectures is included as a regular part of a university course, and the students are charged no additional fee for this; in other cases they pay a very nominal amount.

The management of the organization's activities is vested in a Board of Governors, elected by vote of all the members. The late Bishop McVickar of revered memory, styled at the time of his death by a Congregational minister, "the Bishop of all the churches," served as President until his death. He was succeeded by the Rev. Dr. Bradner, to whose vision and efforts the organiza-

tion of the Institute was mainly due. When Dr. Bradner left Providence and became Director of Parochial Work for the General Board of Religious Education of the Episcopal Church, Bishop McVickar's successor, Bishop Perry, was chosen as President of the Board and has since devoted much time and thought to the interests of the Institute. The membership of the Board has always included the President of Brown University and several members of the Faculty, together with other educational leaders of Providence, and clerical and lay members of various churches of the city.

Had the Institute been organized a year or two later it would very probably have been founded as a local guild of the Religious Education Association, but it was already fully organized before this great Association was established.

The program of the present year's activities began with a public lecture by Bishop Brent upon "The Value and Significance of a Complete Bible." Professor Fosroke, Dean elect of the General Theological Seminary, followed with a course of four lectures upon "The Doctrine of God in the Old Testament." The January course was given by Dr. Macfarland of the Federal Council of Churches; the work of the fifteenth year is to be completed by a course of five lectures upon "The Bible in Relation to Life and Society," given by Dr. Hughes, the Methodist Episcopal Bishop of New England.

A CHURCH SCHOOL PLATFORM

The First Congregational Church School (Columbus, Ohio) undertakes the following responsibilities with reference to its pupils and their parents:

1. To provide regular religious instruction and training.
2. To provide various means whereby a growing religious experience may be expressed.
3. To co-operate with the parents to the best of its ability in meeting any special needs that they care to bring to the attention of teacher or director.
4. To present the meaning and privilege of church membership and provide instruction therein.

The school holds that efficiency in religious education depends upon the parents' or guardian's fulfillment of the following responsibilities:

1. To promote regular attendance and promptness at all sessions.

2. To send the teacher a written excuse for each absence and tardiness.

3. To attend the parents' meetings when possible.

4. So to plan the weekly schedule of the pupil that his religious education will receive attention and time commensurate with its importance.

To assist and encourage such home study, home duties, and other activities, as shall be found, on consultation with the teacher or director and in other ways, to be essential to the pupil's religious education.

5. To provide as far as possible the sort of home life that will give the pupil the influence necessary for his religious growth.

As parent or guardian of the applicant named, I declare myself to be in accord with the principles set forth in this platform. (Signed by parent or guardian.)

SUNDAY-SCHOOL IDEALS

Two progressive Sunday schools have recently published statements of their aims. The first reprinted below is that of the Second Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo. (Rev. Wm. C. Bitting, Pastor). The second is that of Christ Church, Springfield, Mass. (Rev. John Wallace Suter, Jr., Director).

"Throughout the course of study and training three things are kept in prominence, since the main idea of the School is not to teach subjects but to *train life*. These are: (1) Truths appropriate to the person's stage of development, are imparted by methods entirely within reach of the pupil, in such a way that the pupil can easily grasp and assimilate them. (2) The actual doing of the truth. Every class in every department, and so far as possible every member of every class, is expected to be active in some helpful way. We believe that truth should be lived, and we make every effort to encourage the pupil to practice the ideal he has assimilated. The School has a superintendent of expressional work. This work is largely in organized form and is wide in its scope. (3) The fact of contagion is appreciated, and our constant endeavor is to set before our pupils the examples of officers and teachers for the imitative instincts of life, and that the atmosphere of love, righteousness, and service shall be felt by all who enter our School. These three methods are those of Jesus, and are among the best known in our present world of education.

"In all these ways we seek to make vital, practical and real the ideals of Jesus Christ. From the beginning to the end *our aim is to let the pupil know the ideals of Jesus, to trust the pupil's conscience to appreciate them while the Spirit of God reveals them through our work, to induce him to practice them, and to strengthen his effort by the example and companionship of others who are trying to do likewise.* We expect, and are not disappointed in the anticipation, that after a while there comes a time in the life of the boy and the girl when the beauty and glory of these ideals so master the soul that it realizes and wishes to confess its discipleship to Jesus."

"The aim of the School is to educate the children and youth of the parish for enlightened, active loyalty to their Master as members of His Church. The theme of the educational process is three-fold: Instruction in Facts, Training in Worship, and Training in Social Service. Religious education as conceived by this School is education for life; education in character; a training for citizenship in the Kingdom of God. Intelligent Church loyalty, revealing itself in the worship of God and the service of fellow-men, and illumined by knowledge of the truth, is the end sought. Therefore the work will comprise much more than the teaching of facts. The School will do more than instruct; it will train. This, in a word, is the central meaning of Christian nurture; this is the emphasis which distinguishes a Christian Nurture School from a Bible School.

"Many inquiries have been made regarding the new name. Why call it 'Church School' instead of 'Sunday-school'? The answer to this question is suggested in the statement of the School's aim. Two things are true of the School: that it meets on Sundays, and that it is an institution of the Church which educates members of the Church for life in the Church. Of the two truths the latter seems the more important. Furthermore, Church Schools in all denominations are coming more and more to hold sessions during the week as well as on Sundays, with marked success in some places. For these reasons the term 'Church School' is rapidly supplanting the term 'Sunday-school' and only last year our neighbor diocese seriously considered the proposal to change the name of its central organization (which represents all the Schools of the diocese) from 'Sunday School Union' to 'Church School Union'."

THE BOSTON CONVENTION

The program of the Fourteenth Annual Convention was carried out substantially as printed in *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* for February, except that Professor William E. Hocking, of Harvard, spoke in place of Rabbi Friedman who was detained by illness; Professor William Adams Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, spoke in place of President John H. Finley, and an address by Dr. Sidney L. Gulick was added to the last session. At this closing meeting, held in Symphony Hall, one of the most impressive features of any convention was the singing of the Malden Festival Chorus of eight hundred voices, under the direction of Professor H. Augustine Smith.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The Religious Education Association held its fourteenth annual meeting in the Old South Church, Boston, on Thursday, March 1, 1917. The meeting was called to order at 11:10 by the President, Rev. Francis J. McConnell, LL.D., of Denver. On motion of Rev. J. W. F. Davies, Rev. William I. Lawrence was elected Recording Secretary of the meeting.

Pray was offered by Rev. Mr. Lichtleiter.

An address was given by Rev. Francis G. Peabody, LL.D., on "The Religious Education of an American Citizen."

The General Secretary, Rev. Henry F. Cope, D.D., presented his survey, entitled "A Year's Work in World-Wide Religious Education."

Professor Theodore G. Soares, Ph.D., presented the Statement of Principles of the Association, which had been formulated at a previous meeting of the Council. It was

VOTED: That these findings be adopted as the sentiment of the Association and that they be read also at the evening meeting.

Dr. Cope made an appeal for support and caused subscription blanks to be circulated through the audience. The Secretary announced that the next Annual Meeting of the Association probably would be held in Atlantic City, in the latter part of March, 1918, and that the topic for the session will be "The Organization of the Community for Religious Education."

The acting Recording Secretary reported the action of the Council in arranging for a Summer session of the Religious Educa-

tion to be held on Star Island, Isles of Shoals, N. H., beginning on August 14th or 15th.

Rev. Frank K. Sanders, D.D., reported the names of officers nominated for the ensuing year by a committee previously appointed for that purpose, the committee consisting of Dr. Sanders, Dr. Hartshorne, President Murlin, Professor Wood and Miss Dow. The nominations as read were adopted as the nominations of the meeting thus assembled and referred to the Annual Meeting to be held subsequently in Chicago, according to the laws under which the Association is incorporated.

The count of the persons present made by the chief Scout who was in charge of the ushering, showed that the attendance was three hundred and ten.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p. m.

WILLIAM I. LAWRENCE,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE OF THE RELIGIOUS
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

AT THE ANNUAL MEETING AT THE FOURTEENTH GENERAL
CONVENTION, MARCH 1, 1917

Your committee begs leave to report the following list of nominations for the year ending April 30, 1918.

PRESIDENT.

Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D., Columbus, Ohio.

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT.

President Lemuel H. Murlin, LL.D., Boston University, Boston, Mass.

VICE PRESIDENTS

President Clarence A. Barbour, D.D., Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Prof. William Adams Brown, Ph.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Mrs. Ella Lyman Cabot, Boston, Mass.

Hon. P. P. Claxton, Ph.D., U. S. Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.

President Charles W. Dabney, LL.D., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

President Robert A. Falconer, Litt. D., University of Toronto.

President William H. P. Faunce, LL.D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Rev. Dean George Hodges, LL.D., Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.

- Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Sc.D., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
- Right Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.
- President Edgar O. Lovett, Ph.D., Rice Institute, Houston, Texas.
- Bishop William F. McDowell, D.D., Washington, D. C.
- President William R. Poteat, D.D., Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.
- President Edward P. Robertson, Ph.D., Wesley College, University, N. Dak.
- Right Rev. Walter T. Sumner, D.D., Bishop of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
- President Mary E. Woolley, Ph.D., Mt. Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.

DIRECTORS AT LARGE

- Rev. William H. Boocock, Buffalo, N. Y.
- Dean Charles R. Brown, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
- Rev. Carey Bonner, London, England.
- Mr. George W. Coleman, Boston, Mass.
- Mr. William M. Birks, Montreal, Canada.
- Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D.D., Boston, Mass.
- President William T. Foster, Ph.D., Portland, Oregon.
- President A. Gandier, LL.D., Toronto, Canada.
- President Caleb F. Gates, LL.D., Constantinople, Turkey.
- Mr. Henry N. Holmes, F.R.G.S., Army Y. M. C. A., France.
- Dr. Katsuji Kato, Tokyo, Japan, and Chicago, Ill.
- Rev. Edward L. King, M.A., Belguam, India.
- Rev. Hiram H. Lowry, D.D., Peking, China.
- Bishop Edward D. Mouzon, D.D., Dallas, Texas.
- President Edgar Y. Mullins, D.D., Louisville, Ky.
- President Charles S. Nash, D.D., Berkeley, Calif.
- Rev. Doremus Scudder, D.D., Tokyo, Japan.
- Rev. Principal E. T. Rixford, D.D., Montreal, Canada.
- Right Hon. Viscount Bryce, LL.D., London, England.

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

To fill the places of Prof. Coe, Mr. Hall, and President Judson, whose terms of office have expired, we nominate—

Prof. George A. Coe, LL.D., New York City.

Mr. Richard C. Hall, Chicago, Ill.

President Harry P. Judson, LL.D., Chicago, Ill.

STATE DIRECTORS

California—Rev. Miles B. Fisher, B.D., San Francisco.
 Colorado—Bishop Francis J. McConnell, D.D., Denver.
 Connecticut—Prof. Charles F. Kent, Ph.D., New Haven.
 Georgia—Prof. H. H. Harris, B.D., Atlanta.
 Illinois—Prof. W. J. Davidson, Ph.D., Evanston.
 Indiana—President R. L. Kelly, D.D., Richmond.
 Iowa—President John H. T. Main, Ph.D., Grinnell.
 Kansas—President Parley P. Womer, Ph.D., Topeka.
 Kentucky—Prof. W. O. Carver, D.D., Louisville.
 Maine—Prof. Alfred W. Anthony, D.D., Lewiston.
 Massachusetts—Mr. George W. Mehaffey, Boston.
 Minnesota—President Donald J. Cowling, Ph.D., Northfield.
 Montana—Rev. Mark G. Inghram, Red Lodge.
 New Hampshire—Prof. Benjamin T. Marshall, B.D., Hanover.
 New Jersey—Prof. W. J. Thompson, Ph.D., Madison.
 New York—Rev. Herbert W. Gates, M.A., Rochester.
 North Carolina—Rev. Jesse L. Cuninggim, Elizabeth City.
 North Dakota—Prof. Vernon P. Squires, M.A., University.
 Ohio—Prof. Eric M. North, Ph.D., Delaware.
 Oklahoma—Prof. W. W. Phelan, Ph.D., Norman.
 Ontario, Can.—Rev. R. Douglas Fraser, D.D., Toronto.
 Oregon—Rev. W. A. Matthews, Portland.
 Pennsylvania—Rev. W. E. Chalmers, B.D., Philadelphia.
 Rhode Island—Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph.D., Providence.
 So. Carolina—President Henry N. Snyder, Litt D., Spartansburg.
 Tennessee—President John D. Blanton, LL.D., Nashville.
 Texas—Prof. J. F. Kesler, D.D., Waco.
 Vermont—President John M. Thomas, LL.D., Middlebury.
 Virginia—Prof. W. M. Forrest, Charlottesville.
 Washington—President S. B. L. Penrose, D.D., Walla Walla.
 West Virginia—Prof. G. W. Deahl, Morgantown.
 Wisconsin—Prof. Wilson S. Naylor, Appleton.

Respectfully submitted:

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Committee on Nomination</i> | CAROLINE B. DOW J. W. F. DAVIES HUGH HARTSHORNE HERBERT W. GATES LEMUEL H. MURLIN FRANK K. SANDERS IRVING F. WOOD <i>Chairman.</i> |
|--|--|

CHILD WELFARE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

At the beginning of the year 1914, William A. McKeever—since 1900 professor of philosophy at the Kansas State Agricultural College—was authorized by the Board of Administration to remove to the University and organize there a Department of Child Welfare in the Division of Extension.

The new department has attempted to enter a unique and relatively unworked field of service. The central aim has been that of arousing and organizing the community to act as a distinct and centralized authority in the interest of its children, to furnish guidance and safeguards for the young of all ages while acting outside of the home and the school. The following problems are faced:

1. To bring the home, the school, the church and the community into closer co-operation in their service of the young.
2. To provide wholesome play and cultural industry for every child during the summer vacation period.
3. To make the social affairs of adolescents a part of their regular course of training, directed by school authority.
4. To re-direct the motion-picture business so that every minor person shall be provided thereby with clean and instructive entertainment.
5. To provide that every community shall have a central organization authorized to serve and safeguard the moral needs of the young.
6. To foster the church and Sunday school activities of the young and connect these with other forms of juvenile training.
7. To assist in the organization and management of mothers' clubs, parent-teacher associations and kindred societies.
8. To furnish plans and programs for picnics, play festivals, juvenile social centers, the community Halloween, the celebration of Christmas and Independence Day, and the like.
9. To render private assistance to parents and others who are dealing with peculiar and difficult problems of juvenile training.
10. To make a plan whereby the State W. C. T. U., the State Federation of Clubs, the State Sunday School Association, the State Teachers' Association, and the State Executive Department, and many other such agencies, may all act together in an effort to drive the infamous cigarette out of Kansas.

CITIZENSHIP STORIES

(Character sketches with a wholesome tone of patriotism.)

The following graded list of stories was published in *The Christian Register* in the department of "Religious Education," and prepared by Mrs. Clifford B. Hastings.

For all ages: grades 1st to 8th:

A Course in Citizenship. Ella Lyman Cabot, Fannie Fern Andrews, and others.

Children of primary grade, 5 to 8 years.

The Little Hero of Haarlem. In "First Book of Religion," Lane and "Best Stories to Tell to Children," Bryant.

The Leak in the Dyke. Cary.

How Cedric Became a Knight. In "Storyland," Elizabeth Harrison.

Little George Washington. Nora A. Smith. In "The Story Hour."

The Last Lesson (adapted from French of Alphonse Daudet). In "How to Tell Stories to Children," Bryant.

Incident of the Spanish War. Brown. In "Book of Little Boys."

Story of Theseus. In "For the Children's Hour," Bailey and Lewis.

Grandmother's Story of Bunker Hill. Holmes.

Primary Stories of Heroism. William H. Mace.

Children of grammar-school age, 9 to 14 years:—

William Tell. In "Fifty Famous Stories," Baldwin; "Ten Great Events in History," Johonnot; "Told to the Children Series," Marshall; "Life Stories for Young People Series," Upton.

Four Great Americans. Baldwin.

Arnold Von Winkelried. In "Fifty Famous Stories," Baldwin.

Horatius at the Bridge. In "Fifty Famous Stories," Baldwin.

Man Without a Country. Edward Everett Hale.

The Patriotism of Senator Foelker. In "Ethics for Children," Ella Lyman Cabot.

Heroes of Everyday Life. Fannie E. Coe.

Dolly Madison and the Burning of Washington. In "Ethics for Children," Ella Lyman Cabot; "The Children's Hour," Vol. VIII., Tappan.

American Book of Golden Deeds. Baldwin. (Many of these sketches teach patriotism.)

School Speaker and Reader. William De Witt Hyde. (*Selections in American History, Patriotism, etc.*)

Heroes and Heroines of English History. A. S. Hoffman.

How Decius Mus Saved Rome. "Thirty More Famous Stories," Baldwin.

The Little Drummer Boy (adapted), Revenge of Coriolanus, by Charles Morris (adapted), Betsy Ross and the Flag, and Star Spangled Banner, in "Good Stories for Great Holidays," Frances Jenkins Olcott.

The Story of Cincinnatus. Baldwin. In "Fifty Famous Stories."

A Message to Garcia. Elbert Hubbard, Abridged in "Ethics for Children," Ella Lyman Cabot.

American History Stories. Mara L. Pratt.

Stories of Great Americans. Edward Eggleston.

American Hero Stories, and European Hero Stories. Eva M. Tappan.

Junior Citizens. Mabel Hill.

The Book of Patriotism. Edited by T. B. Aldrich. Young Folks Library. Vol. XVIII.

Stories of Our Country. James Johonnot.

Historical Tales—American. Charles Morris.

Biographical sketches or biographies of Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and others.

High-school age and beyond:—

Boys of '76, Boys of '61, Winning His Way, Following the Flag, Coffin.

Brave Little Holland. W. E. Griffis.

History of the Red Cross. Clara Barton.

The Young Citizen. Charles F. Dole.

Two Noble Lives. Laura E. Richards.

Town and City. Gulick.

Carmen Bellicosum. Guy Humphreys McMaster.

Good Citizenship. Richman and Wallach.

The Making of an American. Jacob A. Riis.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Little Lad of Long Ago. In "For the Children's Hour," Bailey and Lewis.

When Lincoln Was a Little Boy. In "Howe's Second Reader." Published by Charles Scribner's Sons.

Lincoln and the Little Girl, He Rescues the Birds, and others in "Good Stories for Great Holidays," Frances Jenkins Olcott.

The Sympathy of Abraham Lincoln, in "An American Book of Golden Deeds," Baldwin.

February Twelfth. In "Cat-tails," Howliston.

Children's Life of Abraham Lincoln. M. Louise Putnam.

True Story of Abraham Lincoln. E. S. Brooks.

Four Great Americans. Baldwin.

Boy's Life of Lincoln. Helen Nicolay.

Abraham Lincoln for Boys and Girls.

Training for Greatness. In "Stories for Life," Marden.

In the Boyhood of Lincoln. Hezekiah Butterworth.

Our American Holidays. Robert H. Schauffler.

Our Holidays, Their Meaning and Spirit. James Otis.

Abraham Lincoln, The Boy and the Man. James Morgan.

Early Life of Abraham Lincoln. Ida M. Tarbell.

Recollections of Abraham Lincoln. W. H. Lamon.

Life of Lincoln. John Hay.

Biographies of Lincoln by James Baldwin, Charles C. Coffin, Noah Brooks, and Carl Schurz.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Little George Washington. In "Story Hour," Wiggin and Smith.

George Washington and His Hatchet. In "Fifty Famous Stories," James Baldwin.

Childhood of George Washington. In "A Course in Citizenship," edited by Ella Lyman Cabot.

Four Great Americans. James Baldwin.

February Twenty-second. In "Cat-tails." Howliston.

February Twenty-second. In "Good Stories for Great Holidays," Frances Jenkins Olcott.

—Our American Holidays. Robert H. Schauffler.

—Our Holidays, Their Meaning and Spirit. James Otis.

Washington's Rules of Conduct. Riverside Literature Series.

Washington's Christmas Gift. Edward Eggleston. In "Stories of Great Americans for Little Americans."

True Story of George Washington. E. S. Brooks.

Washington and His Country. John Fiske.

Washington's Birthday. Robert H. Schauffler.

Biographies of Washington by Horace Scudder, John S. C. Abbott, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Woodrow Wilson.

NEWS AND NOTES

Epiphany Church, Boston, employs a woman on salary whose sole duty is that of developing the religious life in the homes of the parish.

Reviewing fourteen years' work the Missionary Education Movement announces that over one hundred thousand mission study classes have been held.

The Sigma Nu fraternity of the University of Washington has taken a step which may prove a means of valuable education for its members. They have adopted a five-year old destitute boy and are giving him care and over-sight.

The Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor announces Baby Week as from the 1st to the 6th of May. The Bureau publishes a bulletin of suggestions for the observation of the week.

The National Institute for Moral Instruction, Washington, D. C., requests that clergymen everywhere shall send to them statements as to what moral ideas ought to be inculcated in school children.

Members of the R. E. A. should know that the magazine *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* is regularly indexed in "The Readers Guide Supplement" so that references to material in this field, especially the articles published in this magazine, may be found in the Supplement published by the H. W. Wilson Company.

The organization of the Episcopal General Board of Religious Education provides for the maintenance of a central office staff, with Dr. William E. Gardner as General Secretary, and the appointment of "Provincial Secretaries" who stimulate interest in religious education through certain large prescribed areas.

Under the title "System of Religious Education in Secular Schools" the Central Conference of American Rabbis publishes in pamphlet form a valuable and informing discussion, first, of the different systems of religious instruction in schools, and then, of the recent plans of accredited study in religion.

The New York Diocesan Board of Religious Education of the Protestant Church provides a fellowship of five hundred dollars for

the year 1917-18, available for study in the field of Religious Education in some department of Columbia University.

This fellowship is open to men and women, who are members of the Episcopal Church and registered in some parish of the Diocese of New York, and who shall have received the bachelor's degree from a college or university of recognized standing, or who shall be considered by the University Committee on Admissions to have had the equivalent of a college education, and who at the time of making the application shall not be more than thirty years of age.

It is understood that the recipient of the fellowship will devote himself unreservedly to study and practical work, and that his program, which shall include not less than 60 hours of volunteer field work, shall be approved by the Executive Committee of the University Council.

THE HIGH SCHOOL TRAINING CLASS

We are very often asked to suggest textbooks for courses in the psychology of religion suitable for classes of high school age. Here are the suggestions of a well-known teacher of psychology on this subject:

Seashore's Manual is easily first in the list. It is simple, clear, and direct.

James' briefer course I have tried several times with elementary students and found them easily interested in it. It is especially good if one should begin with work toward the middle of the book, say on "Habit."

Another elementary book satisfactory for beginners is Titchener's Primer of Psychology. A well-trained teacher could use also his Outlines of Psychology with elementary students. Two other books, simple and readable, are Angell's and Calkins'.

As for works on the Psychology of Religion, there are none meant for high school students. The first choice would be James' "Varieties." The second would be Ames' "The Psychology of Religious Experience." The third would be Starbuck's "Psychology of Religion." Various other works treat of special themes. Special chapters in some of them, like two or three in Coe's "Spiritual Life," would be entirely within the understanding of students of that grade. Two other books might be mentioned, published by English writers, they are: "Psychology of the Christian Life," Waterhouse, Chas. H. Kelly, London, and "Child Study With Special Application to the Teaching of Religion," Dix, Longmans Co., London.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDUCATION ACCORDING TO SOME MODERN MASTERS. *Charles Franklin Thwing.* (The Platt & Peck Co., New York, \$2.00 net.) These are the very interesting papers which appeared in "School and Society." President Thwing's deep conviction of the spiritual character of education appears constantly in the many apt quotations from the great writers and speakers included in the list of modern masters.

NEW STANDARD TEACHER-TRAINING COURSE. Part One, THE PUPIL. *Luther A. Weigle.* (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soc., Philadelphia.) This is the first in the new series of elementary teacher-training textbooks based on outlines adopted by the Sunday School Council and approved by the International Association. This little book deals with the nature of the child. It is well arranged for study purposes and written from the modern, scientific point of view.

THE CHURCH A FIELD OF SERVICE. *Charles Herbert Rust.* (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soc., Philadelphia, 55c net.) An excellent, well-written and well-arranged textbook for adult classes and for young people at the beginning of church membership. It is a survey of the practical work and the function of the church in the community.

SEX-EDUCATION. *Maurice A. Bigelow.* (The Macmillan Co., New York, \$1.25.) Those who are familiar with Professor Bigelow's work in this field will not be disappointed in the new book. The scientific basis of facts is carefully laid but the chief value of the book will be in its practical studies and suggestions in the problems of teaching this subject. The book concludes with a survey of the development in this field and with a very useful bibliography.

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE CREDIT FOR OUTSIDE BIBLE STUDY. *Clarence Ashton Wood.* (World Book Co., Yonkers, N. Y., \$1.50.) A book like this is indicative of the remarkable development of interest in week-day instruction in religion. After a brief survey of the situation in regard to teaching religion and, particularly the Bible, the development of plans for extra school study and for credits is traced historically and then the methods now employed in different parts of the country are given with accounts of the results achieved; then, following the chapters on the method of operation for the different plans, a bibliography with an account of the different courses of study in use. The book will have value as a summary and survey of this movement up to this date and as putting into convenient form the facts both regarding method and courses of study. In this respect Mr. Wood has rendered a highly valuable service. It is gratifying to find on almost every page references to and quotations from RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, but still more gratifying to consider how the development of this movement

which is less than ten years old indicates the remarkable growth of interest in the whole field of religious training. Workers will find themselves deeply indebted to Mr. Wood.

THE ELEMENTARY DIVISION. *Mary Foster Bryner.* (Fleming H. Revell, New York City, 50c net.) The organization and management of the grades under the "teen age" in the Sunday School. Mrs. Bryner has the practical educational point of view and packs into this book a large amount of information and useful direction for all workers in this division.

THE BASIS OF DURABLE PEACE. *Cosmos.* (Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.) It is time we were facing the problem of world adjustment and reconstruction from every possible angle. These are the papers originally published in *The New York Times* discussing with the utmost candor and with a real attempt at fair-mindedness, the relations of the warring nations and the possible conditions of adjustment.

JOHN AND HIS WRITINGS. *D. A. Hayes.* (The Meth. Book Concern, New York, \$1.75 net.) Dr. Hayes believes that the future statements of Christianity will be largely on the basis of the teachings or the writings of John. This book would make a suitable text for classes of laymen who were prepared to do fairly serious work.

THE SOCIAL BASIS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. *Henry K. Rowe.* (Amer. Bap. Pub. Soc., Philadelphia.) Another of the valuable pamphlets published by the Social Service Commission of the Northern Baptist Convention.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY. *Brother Chrysostom.* (John Joseph McVey, Philadelphia, \$1.25 net.) On the method of preparing the teacher in the Catholic Normal Schools and on the teacher's method in the development of religious character in the pupil. There are abundant quotations from modern literature and a frank discussion of the work and problems of the religious teacher in the Catholic schools. A valuable book for all who are interested in this problem whether from the special point of view of these schools or from the general point of view.

THE SULPICIANS IN THE UNITED STATES. *Charles G. Herbermann.* (The Encyclopedia Press, New York City, \$3.00.) This is a history of the order which had so much to do with the founding of colleges for the training of the clergy of the Catholic church. It is therefore a contribution to the history of theological education and also a contribution to the study of religious education in North America. A faithful and pains taking work.

THE WHITE QUEEN OF OKOYONG. *W. P. Livingstone.* (George H. Doran, New York, \$1.00 net.) While this edition is prepared for, and is suited to children, it is likely to be just as interesting to all adults, for it tells in simple form the fascinating

study of the life of Mary Slessor whose romantic experience and important services as missionary and political leader must be accounted as constituting one of the epics of modern civilization.

PRAYERS FOR EVENTIDE, *Christian R. Reisner*. (Abingdon Press, New York, 25c net.) For family worship. Contains thirty prayers and a number of forms of grace at table.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION, *George A. Coe*.

Professor Coe wrote the first book in the field of the psychology of religion—*The Spiritual Life*, published in 1900. It dealt largely with special problems in the psychology of conversion. His recent book is a striking illustration of the rapid development of the science in these seventeen years. The selected bibliography of books and articles written almost entirely within that period covers eighteen pages. As stated in the preface: "This work is intended primarily as a handbook for beginners in the psychological analysis of religion. The foremost concern, therefore, has been to make clear the nature of the problems, the kind of data, the methods of research, and the achieved results." The point of view is functional and social, though these terms are used with caution. Special problems are brought into the foreground which are pressing for consideration. In the selection and treatment of them the author freely discloses his own attitudes. The formulation of these attitudes will aid the reader to appreciate the fact that the scientific treatment of religion may be carried on consistently by one who is sympathetic with it and works "cordially within a Christian church to make this religion prevail."

The investigation of religion in thoroughly scientific fashion without exempting any phenomena because they are too mystical or too intimate or too profound is vigorously defended. The materials for the study of religion have been gathered in different ways by various authors,—by questionnaires, by examination of literary records, by anthropological research and by experimental methods. Religion is seen to have grown up in the race by a long process of evolution. It was a group phenomenon at first quite completely governed by custom and taboo. It arose from the operation of natural instincts and the organization of rituals and ceremonials around the food process and around epochs in human life. An interesting illustration of the genetic method employed is found in the discussion of religious leaders. In early stages the *shaman* is conspicuous. He is subject to trance induced by dancing, or the sweat lodge, or monotonous music, or torture or drugs. In this state he is "possessed" and is regarded as having unusual authority and power. He also gathers prestige from whatever success and wisdom he wins from experience. The priest guards the cere-

monies, sacred objects and the traditions of the group. He is the successor of the shaman, and is followed in turn by the prophets, the best examples of whom are the great prophets of Israel. These leaders are the exponents as much as they are the pioneers of religion. "A leader does not manufacture religion any more than a gardener makes a rose." The inspiration of religious geniuses is paralleled among artists and scientists. In all cases there are subconscious influences at work.

In the further application of the evolutionary view religion is analyzed in terms of the revaluation of values, of discovery and of social immediacy. All suggest a factor which is often denied to religion, that is, initiative and experimentation. The first is illustrated by the great prophets, Zarathustra, Gautama, Jesus, and Mohammed, who did not accept prevailing standards but transformed them. It is also seen in the sense of sin, in the attribution of ethical character to God, the hope of life after death, and faith in the possibility of a fully socialized society. All of these indicate an expansive, propulsive, idealizing force. This quality has led to discovery, especially in the higher stages of religion. The characteristic discovery is that of the importance of the social order or the ideal association of persons in love and justice. Religion is sometimes backward and socially conservative but this is not to be charged to religion any more than to science. "Science resists science just as religion resists religion. But each has its prophets who break through the resistance." The social immediacy of religion is not radically different from that which appears in science and in art where the workers recognize mutual bonds and interactions. Perhaps it reaches its highest expression in religion which is so intimate and personal. Individuals are dependent upon social relations for individuation and self-consciousness. In religion these social relations are inclusive of ideal beings who extend the group into vast dimensions and therefore provide a profound matrix for the control and nourishment of personality. This relationship is dynamic and presses toward further acquaintance and therefore toward the development of all the selves which share in it. God is interpreted as the common will in such a social order. (p. 261f.)

In a chapter on "Mysticism" the author is careful to say that it is not identical with social immediacy, and that the two are diametrically opposed. In the discussion of the future life, the question is raised whether men desire it. The answer is that they do not desire it for themselves as individuals but in the more advanced societies they desire it for those whom they think deserve it, as in the case of Jesus or Lincoln. This points to the possibility of the development of a society of such indissoluble fellowship between individuals that they are made immortal through it.

Prayer, also, has undergone great changes in the evolution of the race. In its highest form it is conversation in an ideal companionship. It has practical consequences. "It is a way of getting one's self together, of mobilizing and concentrating one's dispersed capacities, of begetting the confidence that tends toward victory over difficulties." Prayer is experienced as a reciprocal relation between God and man, and this is the "culmination of the self-and-socius consciousness that makes us persons."

The final chapter deals with the "Religious Nature of Man." Religion is not natural in the sense of being ready made and fully developed in the individual or the race. But it is natural in the same way as family life, or language or political organization or science or art is natural. It is not an intuition or an instinct or discontent. It is found in the idealizing and socializing evolution of the race. It is therefore likely to persist so long as humanity maintains these characteristics.

The book is a most important contribution to this subject which is likely to rapidly become a storm center of religious interest and also a source of methods and expert guidance for religious instruction and practice. Ministers, students of religion, and thoughtful laymen will find here a scholarly, reverent and prophetic interpretation of religion and one which relates religion to life in a fascinating and inspiring way.

EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES,

NOTICE

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION FOR THE ELECTION OF OFFICERS WILL BE HELD AT THE OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATION, 332 S. MICHIGAN AVE., CHICAGO, ON TUESDAY, APRIL 17TH, AT 10:30 A.M.

The above is the formal notice of the annual meeting of the corporation. The full list of nominations will be sent to all members by mail in ample time so that all may have an opportunity to vote in the election of officers.

PROBLEMS OF RELIGION

By DURANT DRAKE

Professor of Philosophy, Vassar College, Author of Problems of Conduct

This book is designed primarily for thoughtful men and women who wish to put their religious life upon a firm foundation. In it, for the first time, the basic problems of religion are summed up and analyzed by the light of contemporary research.

\$2.00 postpaid

"An able and thorough discussion. Both illuminative and stimulating, even where the reader is unable to agree with the author." —*George A. Gordon, D. D., Boston*

"Written in a clear and vigorous style. Critical but reverent and constructive in spirit." —*Professor Edward S. Ames, University of Chicago*

"A book of exceptional merit. There is in it a fine combination of information and rare insight." —*Professor William F. Boddy, Berkeley, California. Author of The Old Testament in the Light of Today*

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., Boston, New York, Chicago

School and College Credit for Outside Bible Study

A Survey of a Nonsectarian Movement to Encourage Bible Study

By CLARENCE ASHTON WOOD

THE author of this timely volume has made a thorough-going study of the problem of religious education and has set forth in most interesting form in these pages the results of his investigations.

Complete information is given concerning the growth and development of the movement to give academic credit for Bible study carried on outside of school, either in church and Sunday schools, vacation Bible schools, or Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations.

The success of the plan in Colorado, Kansas, North Dakota, Alabama, and other parts of the United States where it is in operation is described and the movement is discussed in all its various aspects.

Educational and religious workers everywhere will find this informing book an indispensable addition to their libraries, and all laymen interested in the religious education of young people will derive profit from a consideration of the facts here set forth.

Included in the volume are a complete bibliography of the literature of the subject, syllabi used in a number of states as a basis for the work, and specimen sets of examination papers used in granting credit for Bible study.

Cloth. viii+317 pages. \$1.50 (Sent postpaid if remittance accompanies order)

WORLD BOOK COMPANY

Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y. 2126 Prairie Ave., Chicago Also Atlanta, Dallas, Manila

CO-OPERATION

Double your own value to the Religious Education Association by getting one new member.

Help your community by seeing that this magazine is taken by the library.

Simply ask us for free literature.

The Religious Education Association
332 South Michigan Avenue CHICAGO

***Textbooks in Religious Education for
College Classes and Adult Study-Groups***

A Series of

Handbooks of Ethics and Religion

a subseries in

**The University of Chicago Publications
in Religious Education**

Volumes Already Issued in This Series

The Ethics of the Old Testament, By HINCKLEY G. MITCHELL.
\$2.00 plus postage; weight 1 lb. 14 oz.

A comprehensive view of the development of ethics and morality among the Hebrew people—the nation that led the ancient world in an attempt to reach the good.

The Story of the New Testament, by EDGAR JOHNSON GOODSPED. \$1.00 plus postage; weight 1 lb.

A clear exposition of the development of the New Testament based upon the definite thesis that "Christianity did not spring from the New Testament but the New Testament from Christianity."

The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion, by HENRY T. FOWLER. \$1.00 plus postage; weight 1 lb.

A remarkable exposition of religious phenomena from a fresh psychological standpoint, combining both structural and functional methods of approach.

The Psychology of Religion, by GEORGE A. COE. \$1.50 plus postage; weight 1 lb. 6 oz.

There are few books which are adapted for use as college texts and are at the same time interesting reading for those outside of scholastic circles. But this book is one of that few.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO - - - - ILLINOIS

2

26